

The Review of English Studies

A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language

Editor JOHN BUTT, B.LITT., M.A. *Secretary* ELLIOT HUTCHINSON

CONTENTS

Ælfric's Share in the Old English Pentateuch. By Josef Raith	305
Why Pericles? By J. M. S. Tompkins	315
Defoe and Richardson on Homer: A Study of the Relation of Novel and Epic in the Early Eighteenth Century. By Ian Watt	325
The Text of Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Hannah More. By Charles H. Bennett	341
'Yes: in the sea of life'. By Kathleen Tillotson	346

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

Essex's Rebellion and Dekker's <i>Old Fortunatus</i> (Fredson Bowers)	365
Milton's Knowledge of Aeschylus: The Argument from Parallel Passages (J. C. Maxwell)	366
Notes on the Influence of Morgann's Essay on Falstaff (Stuart Malcolm Tave)	371

CORRESPONDENCE

Marvell and Sidney (Douglas Bush)	375
-----------------------------------	-----

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT, M.A.; SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS, K.B.E., D.Litt., F.B.A.; R. W. CHAPMAN, D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; H. B. CHARLTON, M.A., D. de Dijon, Litt.D.; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR, B.Litt., M.A., D.Lit.; B. IFOR EVANS, D.Lit.; DOROTHY EVERETT, M.A.; SIR WALTER GREG, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.; EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A.; ALLARDYCE NICOLL, M.A.; A. W. REED, D.Lit.; PERCY SIMPSON, D.Litt., Litt.D., LL.D.; KENNETH SISAM, M.A., F.B.A.; D. NICHOL SMITH, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND, M.A., B.Litt.; ALICE WALKER, D.Litt.; F. P. WILSON, D.Litt., F.B.A.; J. DOVER WILSON, C.H., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; C. L. WRENN, M.A.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editor, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o Clarendon Press, Oxford. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publisher: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (continued)

REVIEWS, ETC.:

The Audience of *Beowulf*, by Dorothy Whitelock, 376;
Chaucer and the Canterbury Tales, by W. W. Lawrence, 377;
Chaucer the Maker, by J. Speirs, 377;
The Secular Lyric in Middle English, by A. K. Moore, 379;
Love's Labour's Lost, ed. R. David, 380;
The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, Why, and How it was Written by Shakespeare, by H. N. Paul, 386;
Readings on the Character of Hamlet 1661-1947, comp. C. C. H. Williamson, 388;
Law Tricks, by John Day (Malone Society Reprint), 389;
Milton's Imagery, by T. H. Banks, 390;
The Plays and Poems of William Cartwright, ed. G. B. Evans, 392;
The Prologues and Epilogues of John Dryden: A Critical Edition, by W. B. Gardner, 397;
On Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, by F. L. Huntley, 397;
Joseph Spence: A Critical Biography, by A. Wright, 399;
James Thomson: Poet of 'The Seasons', by D. Grant, 400;
The Infinite Moment and Other Essays in Robert Browning, by W. O. Raymond, 402;
Formes du roman anglais de Dickens à Joyce, by Irène Simon, 403;
Die englische Sprache: ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung. Erster Bd. Allgemeines: Lautgeschichte, by Karl Brunner, 404;
Summary of Periodical Literature, by A. Macdonald, 407;
List of Publications received, 412;
Index, 414.



C
been
(1912
conta
a tra
cydd
and
xvii.
acco
Otha
(only
'Her
Josep

Jos
beby
his ap
lichar
willen

¹ T
xxvii
the ru
with
swide
'brode
we pe
leaf i
(Bran
Noste
Hieron

R.E.

469

The Review of English Studies

VOL. III, NEW SERIES, NO. 12

OCTOBER 1952

ÆLFRIC'S SHARE IN THE OLD ENGLISH PENTATEUCH

by JOSEF RAITH

CORPUS Christi College Cambridge 201(C) has a text of the second half of the Old English prose *Genesis*, which seems so far to have been overlooked, though it was catalogued by Wanley (1705) and James (1912). The manuscript is bound up in three volumes. The second volume contains (or rather contained, as two leaves are missing) on pages 151–60 a translation of Gen. xxxvii–l. The text has the following rubric: 'Her cydde god ælmihtig his mildheortnisse þe he Abrahame behet and Josepe and Abrahames ofsprincge'; it breaks off right in the middle of Gen. xlvi. 18: 'ne feoh ne orf and þu sylf wast'.¹ We know from Wanley's account that a translation of Gen. xxxvii–l was also contained in Cotton Otho B X (O), a manuscript almost wholly destroyed by the fire of 1731 (only a few charred fragments have remained). There the rubric was: 'Her cydde god ælmihtig his mildheortnysse þe he Abrahame behet and Josepe Abrahames ofspringe'; and the closing passage read:

Josep fordferde þa þa he wæs an hund wintra and ten wintra, and hine man bebyrigde mid wyrtgemange. He wæs gelæd to his earde of Egypta lande to his agenum gecynde, and wearþ bebirged on middon his agenum cynne, þær his lichama hine gerestad od pisne andweardan dæg. Sy lof and wuldor þam well-willendan hælend aa on ecnyse.

¹ The second volume of C.C.C. 201 (pp. 14–78) is written by several hands. Gen. xxxvii–l, written in a clear eleventh-century southern hand, begins on p. 151, l. 4, with the rubric 'Her cydde god ælmihtig his mildheortnisse', breaks off at the bottom of p. 154 with Gen. xli. 2, 'and him þuhte þær he gesawe gan up of dam flode vii fægere oxan and swide uætte' (after which one leaf has dropped out), goes on on p. 155 with Gen. xlii. 20 'brodor to me', and breaks off again at the bottom of p. 160 with Gen. xlvi. 18, 'Ne hele we þe, hlauord, þær we nabbad nader ne feoh ne orf; and þu sylf wast' (after which one leaf is missing). Pages 147–51, l. 3, contain Liebermann's 'Die Heiligen Englands' (Brandl, § 117); pp. 161–76 contain a poem on Doomsday, a poetic rendering of the Pater Noster and the Gloria, an *exhortatio* and an *oratio*, and the *Ordo Confessionis Sancti Hieronimi* (Brandl, §§ 97–98).

I think we may safely assume that the lost ending of the Corpus manuscript was the same as in Otho B X.

It has been suggested that we have here a homily by *Ælfric* on the life of the Patriarch Joseph, which was later incorporated in a complete version of the Pentateuch. S. J. Crawford in his edition of the Old English version of the Heptateuch (E.E.T.S., clx, 1922) mentions this possibility only to reject it as improbable:

Were it not that the 'Incipit' of the Genesis section of O (Otho B X), as given by Wanley, is practically identical with the version in B (Claudius B IV) and L (Laud 509), and that the variants in the surviving fragments of O are chiefly orthographical or phonological, one might have been tempted to assume from its closing passage that what O contained was a homily by *Ælfric* on the life of the Patriarch Joseph (somewhat akin to his homily on Judges), which kept fairly close to the text of the Vulgate. (p. 427.)

This suggestion was again discussed by K. Jost in his most valuable article on 'Unechte *Ælfric*-Texte' [Anglia, li (1927), 177-219]:

Eine Spur einer Josephshomilie ist vielleicht in Wanley p. 192 erhalten, wo aus der zerstörten Hs. Otho B X folgende Zeilen als Schluss der Genesis abgedruckt sind: . . . Falls der Text Otho B X echter *Ælfric* ist — ich glaube, dass daran nicht zu zweifeln ist — so gewinnt man folgende Vorstellung von *Ælfric*'s Übersetzung der zweiten Hälfte der Genesis: *Ælfric* hält sich nicht mehr an den genauen Wortlaut der Vorlage, sondern bietet eine freie Bearbeitung des Stoffes in der Weise, dass selbständige abgerundete Abschnitte entstehen, die, wie sein Auszug aus den Büchern der Könige oder der Makkabäer, für sich gelesen werden können. Ein solcher Abschnitt war die Josephsgeschichte. Dass Joseph vorläufig in Ägypten begraben wurde (Gen. 50/25), wurde als nebensächlich übergangen; dagegen bildete die Überführung der Gebeine Josephs nach dem Lande Kanaan (Exod. 13/19) einen passenden Schluss. (pp. 217-18.)

Ælfric's share in the Old English version of the Pentateuch is still a moot question. What are the facts?

In his Treatise on the Old and New Testament, *Ælfric* begs to be allowed to speak somewhat briefly on the first age of the world (from Adam to the Flood), as he has often written with more thoroughness about this (161), and directs us to other homilies (227) for details on the rise of paganism during the second age of the world (from the Flood to Abraham): the former a reference to Hom. I. 1 (*De initio creaturae*) and the Hexameron homily, the latter a reference to the homily *De falsis diis*. In the same work *Ælfric* sums up the five books of Moses (366):

and god him sette æ, þæt ys open lagu, þam folce to steore, on þam fif bocum þe Moyses awrat swa swa him gewissode god. Ða twa bec [Genesis and Exodus] we nemnodon; Leuiticus is seo pridde, Numerus feorde; seo fifte ys gehaten

Deuteronomium, þæt is 'þer lagu'. Ðas dreo bec us secgad hu hig sippa ferdon ofer þæt widgille westen þær þær nan mann ne wunode ær, and be þam miclum wundrum þe god worhte on him binnan þam feowertigum gearum on ealre þare racu [fare Bodl.]; and we habbad [we hit habbad Bodl.] awend witodlice on englisc.

This can only mean that Ælfric claims to have translated an account of the forty years' wanderings of the Israelites in the wilderness, from their passage through the Red Sea to their arrival in the Promised Land: apparently a reference to Num. xiii–xxvi (xxxii) of the Old English Pentateuch, which looks like a homily by Ælfric later incorporated in the Pentateuch version (Jost 209–10), and which begins:

Æfter dam de Moyses, se mæra heretoga, mid Israhela folce, swa swa him god bebead, ofer da Readan Sæ ferde and Farao adreced wæs, and syddan se almihtiga god him æ geset hæfde, da da seo fyrd com to Pharan dam westene, da cwæd se hefonlica god to dam halgan Moyse;

and ends:

and comon to dam lande, þe hi to lædde god, de he Abrahame behet and his ofsprincke.¹

In his Preface to Genesis, in the form of a prefatory letter addressed to Æthelweard, Ælfric reminds his friend how he had said that he need not labour any further in the book (Genesis) than the story of Isaac, since another had translated it from that point to the end:

þu bæde me, leof, þæt ic sceolde de awendan of lydene on englisc þa poc Genesis; da þuhte me hefingtime þe to tipienne þas, and þu cwæde þa þæt ic ne porfte no mare awendan þære bec buton to Isaace, Abrahames suna, for þam þe sum oder man þe hæfde awend fram Isaace þa poc oþ ende.

The trouble is that we do not know what Ælfric (and Æthelweard) meant by 'buton to Isaace', and 'fram Isaace þa poc oþ ende'. If 'to Isaace' stands for 'exclusive of Isaac', Ælfric would only have to translate Gen. i–xx, as Isaac is born in Gen. xxi; if it stands for 'inclusive of Isaac', Ælfric would have to translate Gen. i–xxxv, as Isaac dies in Gen. xxxv. As Ælfric's translation apparently did not end with Gen. xx, it might well have run on to Gen. xxxv, after which the homily on the Patriarch Joseph would begin.

¹ I am afraid I cannot accept Crawford's interpretation of this passage (366): 'Here Genesis appears with the rest of the Pentateuch among the books which Ælfric claims to have translated into English. It would seem, therefore, that Ælfric, before the composition of his Treatise on the Old Testament, had translated not only the earlier but also the later part of Genesis.' In my opinion, Ælfric does not here refer to Genesis, but only to those three books (Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy), of which he translated or rather epitomized the central part: Num. xiii–xxvi (xxxii).

The two manuscripts Cotton Claudio B IV (B) and Laud 509 (L) contain Ælfric's Preface to Genesis, an English version of the Pentateuch, and Ælfric's homily on Joshua. The Cambridge manuscript Ii 1. 33 (Ca) contains Ælfric's Preface to Genesis and an English version of Genesis which breaks off somewhat abruptly at xxiv. 22 (p. 44). While for the most part identical with the text in BL, Ca contains in Gen. iv-v and x-xi a completely new text, much more literal than BL, which is rather meagre and fragmentary, and in Gen. xxiii-xxiv a text that is again much fuller than BL, though substantially identical as far as the two texts agree. The two manuscripts Corpus Christi College Cambridge 201 and Cotton Otho B X contain an English version of Gen. xxxvii-l. The two manuscripts are defective, Otho B X having been almost wholly destroyed by the fire of 1731 and Corpus 201 having lost two leaves. The text is substantially the same as in BL. Where it deviates from the BL text, it is either inferior or at least posterior (though in a very few cases the CO text has apparently preserved the original reading).

The close of Genesis xxxvii-l in Otho B X (and C.C.C.C. 201) differs considerably from the text of the Pentateuch version (B and L). Here are the two passages:

Otho B X

Josep fordferde þa þa he wæs an hund
wintra and ten wintra, and hine man
bebyrigde mid wyrtgemange. He wæs
gelæd to his earde of Egypta lande to
his agenum gecynde, and wearþ be-
birged on middon his agenum cynne,
þær his lichama hine gerestad od þisne
andweardan dæg. Sy lof and wuldon
þam well-willendan hælend aa on
ecnyses.

B and L

Josep forþferde þa he wæs an hund
wintra and tin wintre, and hine man
bebyrigde mid wyrtgemange. He wæs
gelæd of [on L] his stowe of Egypta
lande.

Similarly the close of Num. xiii-xxxi points forward to future events, for which there is no *raison d'être* in the Vulgate: 'and comon to dam
lande þe hi to lædde god, de he Abrahame behet and his ofsprincge.'

The translation is sometimes very literal, sometimes extremely meagre and fragmentary. In one case the translator omits a passage which he thinks it best not to translate, and states his reasons: after Gen. xix. 3 we read 'se leodscipe wæs swa bysmorful þæt hi woldon fullice ongean gecynd heora galnysse gefyllan, na mid wimmanum ac swa fullice þæt us sceamad hyt openlice to secgenne'. In one case the translator reminds us that the Jewish custom of circumcision is no longer in force: after Gen. xvii. 27 he adds 'nu sege we betwux þisum þæt nan cristen man ne mot nu swa don'. In four cases the translator refers us to the Latin original for further

information: Gen. xxii. 20-24 'Him wiard siddan gesæd þæt xii sunu weron acennodon his breþer Nachor: þære naman sind awritene on þære leden-race, ræde þær se de wille' (Ca only); Gen. xxiv. 11-60 'and he dær Isaace wif gefette, swa swa hyne hys hlaford het and him god wissode, swa hyt on þære leden-bec awritten ys, ræde se þe wylle' (BL only); Gen. xxxiv. 1-26 'Emores sunu Sichem ræfode hi [Dina] and slæp mid hire, him and ælle is mægum to muculum hærme, swa seo leden-boc sprycd' (late twelfth-century gloss in B); Gen. xl. 2-27 'He him sæde þa swa hit on þære leden-bec awritten is, ræde þær se þe wille.' Num. xxv has a similar reference: 'Hit stent on odrum bocum þæt Balaam swa deah tæhte þam cyningce hu he cuman mihte þæt he hi beswice.'

The translation is not continuous. There are a few breaks, where a new chapter begins with a rubric or a short summary of what went before. There is a rubric at the beginning of Gen. xii: 'Her swutelad þæs ælmihtigan godes mildheortnysse and hys wundra, hu he Abraham geceas and hys bletsunga him sealde and hys ofspringe.' There is another rubric at the beginning of Gen. xxxvii: 'Her cydde god ælmihtig hys mildheortnysse, þe he Abrahame behet on Josepe Abrahames ofspringe.' And there is a short introductory summary at the beginning of Num. xiii: 'Æfter dam de Moyses, se mæra heretoga, mid Israhela folce, swa swa him god bebead, ofer da Readan Sæ ferde and Farao adreñced wæs, and syddan se ælmihtiga god him æ geset hæfde.'

Jost has conclusively shown that from a linguistic point of view the bulk of Gen. i-xxiv and Num. xiii-xxvi (xxxii) is the work of Ælfric, whereas the rest cannot be by him: both vocabulary and syntax point to two (or more) different authors.

How do these facts fit into a consistent whole? Who put together the Old English version of the Pentateuch that has come down to us? Ælfric or the 'other man', who is said to have translated the second half of Genesis, or somebody else? What is Ælfric's share anyhow? Has he attached his Preface to a complete version of 'the book' (Genesis) or only to the first half 'as far as Isaac'? Does the Cambridge manuscript contain Ælfric's translation of the first half, and the Corpus manuscript the other man's translation of the second half? How can we explain the discrepancies between the BL text and the Ca text of the first half? These and half a dozen other questions have to be answered.

Let us begin with the last question: how can we explain the discrepancies between the Ca text and the BL text of the first half of Genesis? We have seen that Gen. iv-v and x-xi are independent translations from the Vulgate, Ca rather literal and BL meagre and fragmentary, whereas Gen. xxiii-xxiv is substantially the same text, but again much fuller in Ca than in BL. It is commonly assumed that the BL text of Gen. xxiii-xxiv was

extracted from the Ca text, which would then represent the original draft. I am quite willing to accept this explanation, with certain reservations, as we shall see later on. As regards Gen. iv-v and x-xi, two possibilities have so far been discussed: either a scribe of the BL text or a scribe of the Ca text substituted a translation of his own for the one he found, or failed to find, in the manuscript he was copying. As we have already observed BL cutting the Ca text of Gen. xxiii-xxiv down to its bare outlines, we should expect a similar procedure here (Jost has, indeed, shown that from a linguistic point of view Gen. iv-v and x-xi in BL do not fit into the context: they are a heterogeneous element in an otherwise homogeneous whole); but why BL should go back to the Vulgate and ignore the Ca text is a question which has so far puzzled every investigator. The obvious explanation would be a defective manuscript which a scribe wanted to eke out; but the two gaps cannot have been caused by two lost leaves, as they are not of the same length, and as such a gap would never exactly tally with the beginning and end of a chapter. Is there no other possibility? I think there is. I suggest that *Ælfric's* version did not contain Gen. iv-v and x-xi, and that two scribes tried to fill in these two gaps independently.

If we examine the two gaps more closely, we find that they are almost wholly made up of genealogies. It is true that Gen. iv-v has the story of Cain and Abel, and Gen. x-xi has the story of the Tower of Babel; but the rest is genealogies. On the other hand, Gen. i-iii and Gen. vi-ix are two pieces complete in themselves, the former the story of the Creation and the Fall of Man, ending with the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, the latter the story of the Flood and the Ark, ending with Noah's death; and with Gen. xii the story of Abraham begins with a rubric which marks a definite break.

Jost attempts to show that the Ca text is all of a piece and the work of *Ælfric* throughout, whereas the BL text in Gen. iv-v and x-xi is the work of a monk whose language differed considerably from that of *Ælfric*. But even he has to admit that now and then the language of Ca deviates a little from *Ælfric's* language (194), and that Ca has mistakes which we should be loath to lay at *Ælfric's* door (198). These deviations and mistakes are easily explained, if we assume that *Ælfric* had skipped these four chapters, as he might well have done without impairing the sequence of events, and that two monks tried to fill in the two gaps independently, one (Ca) in a language closely resembling *Ælfric's*, the other (BL) in a language rather different from it.

I may as well state here that I suspect another gap after Gen. xxiv, though I am not sure, as we have only the BL text to go by. It is true that Gen. xxv-xxvi has such important facts as Abraham's death and the birth of Jacob and Esau; but the rest is again genealogies, and Gen. xxvii

(‘Da Isaac ealdode’) looks like a new beginning. Anyhow, there can be no doubt whatever that Gen. xxv is by the same man who translated Gen. iv, as the two chapters have one word in common which is extremely rare in Old English and which Ælfric never uses: *eordtilia* ‘agricola’ (the usual word is *yrdling*). Here are the two passages. iv. 2: ‘fuit autem Abel pastor ouium et Cain agricola’, ‘Abel wæs sceaphyrde and Cain eordtilia [Ca hirdling]’; xxv. 27: ‘factus est Esau uir gnarus uenandi et homo agricola’, ‘pa wæs Esau gleaw huntia and eordtilia’.

And here we are landed in the midst of another question: how far did Ælfric translate? It is commonly assumed that Ælfric’s translation is ‘evidently’ preserved in the Cambridge manuscript Ii 1.33 (twelfth century), which contains the Preface to Genesis and Gen. i–xxiv. 22. But Ælfric cannot have stopped short in the middle of ch. xxiv. It looks as if BL had preserved the original ending, where after Gen. xxiv. 10 the rest of the chapter is summed up (quite in Ælfric’s manner): ‘and he dær Isaace wif gefette, swa swa hyne hys hlaford het and him god wissode, swa hyt on þære leden-bec awritten ys, ræde se þe wylle.’ Ca must then have rejected this summary and replaced it by a literal translation of the Vulgate (in Ælfric’s alliterative manner), which breaks off at xxiv. 22 (though ‘god heriende’ apparently forestalls xxiv. 26 ‘et adorauit dominum’) for reasons which are beyond conjecture; maybe sickness or death took the pen out of his hand, maybe one or more leaves dropped out of a manuscript—we do not know.

Which of the two versions is by Ælfric? The summary of BL with the offhand reference to the ‘Latin book’ or the literal translation of Ca in alliterative prose? I think that the ‘Latin book’ of BL outweighs the alliterative prose of Ca. The same reference occurs after Gen. xxii. 19, though only in Ca and not in BL: ‘Him wiard siðdan gesæd þæt xii sunu wæron acennodon his brefer Nachor: þære naman sind awritene on þære leden-race, ræde þær se de wille.’ The two references must come from the same hand, and must have been an integral part of the original draft. The first was cut out by the BL redactor when he dropped the passage about Nachor’s twelve sons; the second was cut out by the Ca redactor when he substituted a detailed account of Eliezer’s interview with Rebecca for the summary statement. I am afraid there is only one alternative left, which I am unwilling to accept: that we have here an earlier and a later draft by Ælfric himself.

How far, then, did Ælfric translate? We cannot escape the fact (I think we may safely call it a fact) that Gen. xxiv. 61 marks a definite break from a linguistic point of view, though I am afraid Ælfric’s ghost hovers over Gen. xxvii–I (Jost has the same uneasy feeling).

I have already hinted at the possibility that Gen. xxv–xxvi may be a gap

bridged over by the BL redactor in the same way in which Gen. iv-v and x-xi were bridged over.

With Gen. xxvii the story of Jacob and Esau begins, and is told in a fairly straightforward way up to the death of Isaac at the end of Gen. xxxv. As it stands, the text cannot be by *Ælfric*; but I think I have found the point where *Ælfric* has betrayed himself. It is a passage that, for one reason or other, has dropped out of BL, but is fortunately preserved in a gloss copied into B about the second half of the twelfth century from another manuscript now lost, where we hear that (Gen. xxxiv. 1-26)

Emores sunu Sichem ræfode hi [Dina] and slæp mid hire, him and ælle is mægum to muculum hærme, swa seo leden-boc sprycd; and ræde se þe wyle, hu ornoslice Jacobes sunes Dina, hære suster, hut ledde, and Emor and Sichem is sune and hære maegion and eac ælla þa to ham comen ofslogon mid swurdes ecge and gecyrdon gesunde to hæra getelde.

Unless we assume that somebody had in the meantime learnt the trick, the reference certainly looks as if it had been put in by *Ælfric*.¹

With Gen. xxxvii the story of Joseph begins, again told in a fairly straightforward way up to the death of Joseph at the end of Gen. l. As it stands, the text cannot be by *Ælfric*; but here again I think I can trace *Ælfric's* hand in Gen. xl ix, where Jacob's address to his sons (Gen. xl ix. 2-27) is summed up: 'He him saede þa swa hit on þære leden-bec awritten is, ræde se þe wille.' The rubric recalls the one that introduces the story of Abraham. We have seen that Gen. xxxvii-l is also preserved in Corpus 201 and Otho B X, though both manuscripts are defective. The rubric is the same, but the ending is different. There can be no doubt that the ending in Otho B X (and Corpus 201) is the original one (Jost 217). The Vulgate has: 'mortuus est expletis centum decem uitae suis annis; et conditus aromatibus repositus est in loculo in Ægypto' (Gen. l. 26). Whoever translated the passage remembered that the Israelites took the bones of Joseph with them when they left Egypt (Exod. xiii. 19) and finally buried them in Shechem (Joshua xxiv. 32). But whoever struck out the reference to Joseph's burial in his native place bungled the passage: 'he was gelæd of his stowe of Egypta lande' (apparently meant as a translation of the Vulgate 'repositus est in loculo in Ægypto') does not make sense, and the L scribe accordingly tried to improve upon it by writing 'on his stowe'.

I confess that when I came across the Corpus version of Gen. xxxvii-l I was convinced that I had found a homily, by the 'other man' mentioned in *Ælfric's* Preface to Genesis, on the life of the Patriarch Joseph, which was later incorporated in a complete version of the Pentateuch. This con-

¹ The fact that we have here to fall back on a late-twelfth-century gloss should be a warning. We can never hope to clear up everything; too many manuscripts have been lost.

viction was badly shaken when I looked into the matter more closely. The rubric that introduces the homily recalls the rubric that introduces the section on Abraham. The reference to the 'Latin book' in Gen. xlix (unfortunately lost in both manuscripts) recalls three similar references in previous chapters. And who translated Gen. xxvii–xxxv (the story of Jacob and Esau), since Ælfric's translation apparently ends with Gen. xxiv? I can think of only one explanation, though I am reluctant to propose it. I would suggest that Gen. xxxvii–l, as preserved in the two manuscripts, was, for one reason or other, copied from a complete version of Genesis; and I would, moreover, suggest that this Genesis version ended with the homily ending of Otho B X: 'sy lof and wuldon þam well-willendan hælend aa on ecnyse'.

The newly discovered text of Gen. xxxvii–l does not help us to settle the question of priority. Where it deviates from the standard text it is either inferior or at least posterior (though in a very few cases the CO text has apparently preserved the original reading). If we leave aside the evident mistakes, the deviations of C(O) are mostly slight additions, made for the sake of clearness, and changes of construction and word order. We are, of course, inclined to suppose that the monk who extracted the story of Joseph from a complete Genesis version touched it up a little; but the variant readings afford no proof for such a supposition.¹

In his Treatise on the Old and New Testament Ælfric has with scrupulous and almost pedantic care enumerated all his Old Testament versions, and referred the reader to them for further study (curiously enough, of the two manuscripts which have this treatise, Bodl. 343 has omitted all these references with two exceptions: the one in which Ælfric states that he has translated Num. xiii–xxvi (xxxi), and the one about Judith). In addition to the references already mentioned, he draws our attention to his Liber Josue, which he translated for Æthelweard, to his Liber Judicum, to his homily on the Sevenfold Gifts of the Holy Ghost (Napier viii) after

¹ The evidence of the variant readings is rather puzzling. I would set no great store by xxxvii. 31 BC 'osnidon': L 'ofsnidon'. xlii. 35 BC 'tugon': L 'guton' (effunderunt), however, can only be accounted for by assuming that Gen. xxxvii–l in CO was copied from a manuscript half-way between the original of BL and B. But such an explanation is *eo ipso* impossible, as we have seen that the close of the Genesis version in BL is apparently a not very skilful redaction of the close of the Genesis version in (C)O, and as B and L have several mistakes in common where C seems to have preserved the original reading. But this is not all. What about the following two variants: xlvi. 15 BC 'hi dorston sprecan wiþ hine': LO 'hig ne dorston sprecan wiþ hine' (ausi sunt loqui ad eum); xlvi. 29 LO 'he clypte [O clypte] hine and weop': BC 'he clypode [C cleopode] hyne and weop' ('irruit super collum eius et inter amplexus fleuit')? And what about xxxviii. 23 LC 'hæbbe hire þæt [þæt] heo hafad': B 'hæbbe hire' (habeat sibi)? Another puzzling case is xxxvii. 24, where the Vulgate 'in cisternam veteram quae non habebat aquam' corresponds to 'on pone ealdan pytt' in C and 'on pone wæterleasan pytt' in BL. I cannot get rid of the uneasy feeling that the monk who copied out Gen. xxxvii–l in CO had a manuscript of the Vulgate within reach.

Isaiah, to his homily on Kings (iii. 19), to his homily on Job (ii. 36), to a passage about Daniel in the lions' den in a homily (i. 37), to the two homilies, both 'on ure wisan', on Esther and Judith, and to his Maccabees (iii. 28).

This looks like a fairly complete catalogue of *Ælfric's* Old Testament homilies; but there is not a word about a homily on Joseph. He refers to Joseph in the course of his treatise (302):

His ginsta sunu buton anum wæs Joseph gehaten; weard dær hlaford on Egypa lande under þam cininge, him swide gecweme; and he heold his fæder on fullum wurdscipe þær mid eallum his brodrum and heora bearnum samod; and se Joseph leofode on þam lande mærlice hundteontig geara and tin to eacan.

If *Ælfric* had written a homily on Joseph, this would have been the place to mention it, and we may be sure that he would not have failed to mention it, had he written one.

What, then, was *Ælfric's* share in the Old English Pentateuch? In his Treatise on the Old and New Testament he is silent about a translation of the Pentateuch, though he refers to a number of homilies on Old Testament subjects, including one on Numbers xiii-xxvi (xxxii), which we find again in the Pentateuch version. In his Preface to Genesis he reminds *Æthelweard* how he had said that he need not translate any farther than the story of Isaac, since another had already translated the rest of the book (Genesis). The Preface is in the form of a prefatory letter accompanying an English version of—what? Of the first half of Genesis only or of the whole? We do not know, and the Preface gives no clue. The obvious answer would be: the first half of Genesis only, i.e. that part which he had been asked to translate. I suggest that *Ælfric's* prefatory letter accompanied a translation of the whole of Genesis, of which he had done the first half himself (exclusive of chapters iv-v, x-xi, and possibly xxv-xxvi), and of which the second half was the work of that 'other man', tagged on by *Ælfric* himself. The homily ending may have been in the other man's copy, it may have been added by *Ælfric*—we do not know.

This Genesis version seems to be lost, unless Gen. xxxvii-1 in CO is copied from it. Ca is a fragment of a revision by some unknown monk, who tried to fill in some of the gaps left by *Ælfric*. BL, on the other hand, is a totally different work: it is an attempt to put together a vernacular version of the whole Pentateuch, using *Ælfric's* version of Genesis (itself a compilation) and his version of Num. xiii-xxvi (xxxii), and again trying to fill in some of the gaps left by *Ælfric* in his Genesis version. And it was this compiler who tampered with the closing passage of *Ælfric's* Genesis, to fit it into a version of the Pentateuch.

I admit that I am piling hypothesis upon hypothesis, but I know of no other way of accounting for such a variety of disconcerting facts.

T
why,
basis
play
ship
Beau
grou
lines
ship
of hi
other
move
of th
dram
quar
into
play'
lived
a fav
popu
based
speak
includ
knigh
and a
can b
appea
and s
play;
expla
beaut
What
perfo

WHY PERICLES?

By J. M. S. TOMPKINS

THERE are many questions in the study of Shakespeare that can never be answered and yet may be asked not unprofitably. One of these is why, so soon after his noblest achievements, he chose or accepted as the basis of a play what Ben Jonson called the 'mouldy tale' of *Pericles*. The play has been much discussed in connexion with the problem of its authorship and its relation to the new fashion of romantic plays brought in by Beaumont and Fletcher. It has also been treated as a member of the last group of Shakespeare's plays, the Romances. But no approach on these lines quite faces the question. Whatever solution to the problem of authorship commands itself—whether Shakespeare took up again an early play of his own, or agreed to finish and furbish one by George Wilkins or some other dramatist, or had been reading Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and was moved to experiment in a remote, legendary tone—the challenging oddity of the choice remains. Nor can it be accounted for entirely in the terms of dramatic fashion and its own success. Certainly it was successful. All the quartos—there were six from the first publication in 1609 to its adoption into the second issue of the Third Folio in 1664—call it a 'much-admired play'; it crowded the *Globe*; it was carried to court more than once, and lived on into the Restoration, while the part of *Pericles* is said to have been a favourite with Burbage and Betterton was highly applauded in it. A popular success is not based on a few exquisite minutes; in this case it was based, doubtless, on marvel and spectacle. The title-pages of the quartos speak, in varying terms, of 'strange and worthy accidents'; the spectacle included a show of severed heads, a banquet with a dance of armoured knights, a storm at sea, a divine apparition on a ship with black banners, and a solemn service in Diana's temple; and, though the part of *Pericles* can hardly have stretched Burbage, it offered him a series of effective appearances in kingly robes, drenched garments, rusty armour, and a beard and sackcloth. It is clear that the King's Men found their account in the play; but, if we think of it simply as a business enterprise, we leave unexplained both the flat naïvety of many scenes and the intense quality of the beauty in a few; for even as a business enterprise it remains in part obscure. Whatever the need for a new success by Shakespeare (whose most recent performances, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*, Mr. Ivor Brown¹ surmises may not have been successful), gentle Master Shakespeare could

¹ Ivor Brown, *Shakespeare* (London, 1949), pp. 251, 264.

surely, at this stage of his career, have said, however gently: 'Not that one, I think.' He had a choice. And if the need was to find a counter-attraction to the glittering novelty of *Philaster*, the claims of the thousand-year-old story of Apollonius of Tyre to provide it are not self-evident. There is no strong resemblance between the plays. Nothing can be less like the neat and exciting co-ordination of complex plot-material which was the special mark of Beaumont and Fletcher—'the crafty mazes of the cunning plot'—than this ambling and transparent narrative of a prince of Tyre whose sails beat round the Mediterranean from youth to age, who uncovers a royal scandal at Antioch, is wrecked and married in Pentapolis, casts his wife's body overboard near Tarsus, where he leaves his infant daughter, and after fourteen years recovers the one at Mytilene and the other at Ephesus. There could not be a more awkward story to dramatize. In structure *Pericles* is an old-fashioned play, a mere chronological sequence of disconnected adventures. In tone, the shadowy atrocity of its first act makes no attempt to rival the hot impulses and iniquities of the younger playwrights, whatever may be thought of Dionyza and the brothel scenes.

On the other hand, the likenesses between the play and Shakespeare's other Romances are obvious, and emphasis on them has perhaps obscured those points wherein they differ. Here is the theme of loss and restoration, accomplished in the second generation; womanly purity seen in contrast to the ugliness of corrupt flesh and spirit; the menace of the sea and the heavenly intimations of music; the dramatization of 'Providence divine'; and here, connecting *Pericles* especially with *Cymbeline*, is the come-and-go of the poet's imagination, rising to moments of penetrating and delicate beauty and forcible truth, projecting moods and situations but seldom a character, and not infrequently sinking to such low pressure as is required for activating, upon a stage well used to convention, the figures of a wicked foster-mother, a faithful servant, or a good physician. But again, to classify is not wholly to explain. Certainly Shakespeare's imagination was filling and rejoicing in the theme of restoration as it had never done before, except in that brief and threatened reunion of Lear and his daughter; this will be apparent to anyone who will compare the beauty of the few words in which Pericles receives Thaisa, Posthumus Imogen, and Leontes Hermione with the business-like minimum devoted to Claudio's recovery of Hero and the silence of Isabella when her brother returns from death; but, even supposing that Shakespeare was consciously looking for a plot that culminated in such a situation, still, why did he select *Pericles*? He could have found, and did find, better plots; based on stronger human interest and capable of more sustained treatment. Moreover, *Pericles* lacks the strongest note of the plays that succeeded it, the error that must be atoned, the revengeful hatred that must be disclaimed and dissolved. *Pericles* has no

guilt to be washed away; even his intended punishment of Cleon, stressed in the sources, slips from view in the play, and the epilogue tells us that the gods took it into their own hands. As a character he is almost static; he is the sport of fortune; the years and the great seas break over him; at last he turns his face to the wall, but in a despair that is silent and unrebellious; and then the gods restore to him the treasures they have reserved, and reward his patience.

Perhaps it is here that the key of the problem lies. Of all Shakespeare's heroes Pericles is the most patient man—one would have said the only patient man but for Brutus, and Brutus's cheerless patience is part of his Stoic philosophy and is worn and frayed before he finds his rest at Philippi. All the other heroes are dominated, as Elizabethan tragic heroes are bound to be, by impulse, passion, resentment, leading to physical and spiritual violence. They have moods of weary suffering, but this is not patience but numbness and melancholy. They recognize their deprivation. They cry out for patience, like Lear—'You heavens, give me that patience, patience I need!'—and recognize it enviously in others, like Hamlet; their present state is contrasted with a former time when they exercised patience, as in *Othello*; but for them, in their self-destructive anguish, the heavenly virtue which Othello, with his young wife's face before him, sees as a 'young and rose-lipp'd cherubim' has 'turned [its] complexion' and looks 'grim as hell'. Only Timon and Cleopatra, who dwell in extremities, never salute patience with bruised lips; to her it is 'sottish'; and Coriolanus, least analytic of them all, seems never to perceive that he is impatient. It is, nevertheless, by one of Shakespeare's ironies, Coriolanus who describes that aspect of patience which is presented in the Romances. As he goes into banishment, he turns to console his mother by quoting her own words, reminding her that she has been used to tell him that

fortune's blows

When most struck home, being gentle wounded craves
A noble cunning.¹

To be gentle wounded means, I think, to preserve the temper and training of the spirit under heavy calamity. The word 'wounded' dissociates the conception from the theoretical 'invulnerability' of Seneca's man, in which Shakespeare did not believe; not is he thinking of mere submission, still less of a politic and wary self-control. What he means cannot enter the mind of Coriolanus, who throws the phrase with others into the gulf of his mother's grief and then forgets it; but it is beautifully exemplified in Pericles.

In the first two acts his figure is merely outlined, but the poses are in

¹ *Coriolanus*, iv. i. 7-9.

harmony with what is to come. He masters himself to accept quietly the undeserved rebuke of Helicanus and the necessity of exile, and endures a ruinous shipwreck with constancy and cheerfulness. The third act is another matter; here a crushing blow falls in the death of Thaisa in child-bed, in the tumult of a storm at sea, and Shakespeare enters into the depth of his subject. What he shows us is not the Stoic discipline under grief; he had dramatized that in *Brutus*, and then, perhaps, finding his first version morally showy, rewritten the scene. *Pericles* is no Stoic; there is no theoretical stiffening in his attitude, nor does he take Fortune's buffets and rewards with equal thanks, or call contempt of pain his own. He is wounded to the quick, yet 'gentle'. The scene, enacted, as it were, in the hollow of a great wave of Fate, is instinct with tenderness. There is no human clamour to match the sea's outrage. Lychorida tells him of his loss in the last words of a sentence that begins by offering to him his only consolation, the child of his dead queen; and, after a stunned exclamation and one agonized question of the gods, he obeys her injunction to be manly and take comfort for the child's sake, holding and blessing it in the name of the gods who have robbed him of its mother. Immediately the sailors come, blunt with their necessity and their embarrassment, to insist on clearing the ship of the dead. He remonstrates once—'That's your superstition!'—and then yields to their conviction, issuing quiet orders, accepting thankfully the 'caulked and bitumed' chest they offer for a coffin, and still addressing them singly as 'good mariner', 'gentle mariner'. We overhear his intimate address to his wife:

A terrible child-bed hast thou had, my dear;
No light, no fire . . .¹

and then he controls himself to say the 'priestly farewell' which we do not hear. And even before he commits her to the 'humming water', he has turned to consider Marina's welfare.

In this picture of what it is to be 'gentle wounded' Shakespeare has done his best with *Pericles*. It is not an effect that bears much repetition or enlargement. At Tarsus he shows the same sober manhood, and replies to Dionyza's lamentations with an expression of that primitive and universal piety which results from man's sense of his subordination in a world of mysterious forces, and for which the name of philosophy is too pretentious:

We cannot but obey
The powers above us. Could I rage and roar
As doth the sea she lies in, yet the end
Must be as 'tis.²

Then, after a touch of sad kindness to Lychorida, he makes for Tyre.

¹ *Pericles*, III. i. 57-58.

² *Ibid.* III. iii. 9-12.

The supposed loss of Marina, fourteen years later, is cast into dumb-show.

Enter Pericles with his train at one door; Cleon and Dionyza at the other. Cleon shows Pericles the tomb of Marina; whereat Pericles makes lamentation, puts on sackcloth, and in a mighty passion departs.¹

We can translate Pericles' 'mighty passion' as vehement grief. If Shakespeare, poet of so many moving laments and passionate outcries, ever gave words to this scene, they are lost; but he may have reduced it to dumb-show as he was to reduce Leontes' recovery of Perdita to a fantasticated narrative, in order to keep the main dramatic stress where he wanted it, while satisfying his audience with attractions of another order.² We know the tomb is empty, and Gower is at hand to distinguish between 'borrow'd passion' and 'true old woe', and to comment on the King's state. Some breach of patience is indicated; the wound has been deep enough to lame the will to live, though not to drive Pericles to rebellion. The emphasis is as much on what he preserves as on what he lets go. Gower tells us:

He bears
A tempest, which his mortal vessel tears,
And yet he rides it out.³

At Mytilene Helicanus tells the Governor that Pericles has not spoken for three months, or taken sustenance 'but to prorogue his grief'; yet he has taken sustenance, and he has not cursed the gods. It is to his daughter, however, that at this point the palm of patience is transferred. When she comes aboard his ship to console him with her music, he pushes her back without looking at her, but, when he looks, he compares her to the image of that virtue with which he had been so closely acquainted:

Thou dost look
Like Patience gazing on kings' graves, and smiling
Extremity out of act.⁴

Dr. Edith Sitwell, who would like to believe that *Pericles* is substantially an early play, says of these lines, with some others, that they 'would seem to pressage some of the wonders in the later works, although they are of an infinitely lesser greatness and command'.⁵ She does not specify what she has in mind, but the reader is bound to think of Viola's perfect speech. It is with great misgiving that one differs from her on such a point. Yet even if Viola's speech is the more beautiful, it does not prove that the *Pericles* passage was written first. It might be a blurred and roughened echo of Viola's image, brought up by association with the same strain of feeling

¹ *Ibid.* iv. iv.

² Cf. *ibid.* iv. iv. 21-22, in which Gower indicates the coming dumb-show.

³ *Ibid.* iv. iv. 29-31.

⁴ *Pericles*, v. i. 136-8.

⁵ *A Notebook on William Shakespeare* (London, 1948), p. 208.

and without the first sharpness of discovery. But is it? Are not the features that differentiate it those that fit it more eloquently into its own dramatic context? It has a heavier, more masculine movement than Viola's liquid words. The complete line is weighted with the important monosyllables 'kings' graves', and the half-line begins with the polysyllable 'Extremity' and ends with the stopped consonants of 'act'. Viola had exercised patience according to the scope and colour of romantic comedy, a delicate resignation, touched with humour and hope. Her fantasy of her sister gives her view of herself, fixed in a 'green and yellow melancholy' but 'smiling at grief'. She will not follow up the sombre tomb-imagery that her 'monument' has evoked. She is passive in the hands of a riddling Fate, but vital and young. Pericles, however, believes himself to stand on the edge of the grave, and what he sees in Marina is no delicate resignation, but such a royal fortitude as might well adorn kings' graves, and ought to adorn his own, one whose smile not only confronts but disarms calamity. He has already associated her with other kingly virtues and images; she looks, he tells her, 'modest as justice' and seems 'a palace for the crown'd truth to dwell in'. Now she is patience, transcendent over such extremities as befall royal persons, heavier in weight as in sound than Viola's private 'grief'. He feels a reproach in her bearing, is ready to believe against likelihood that her woes have equalled his, and accepts from her the adjuration to be patient. The rest of the scene, for all its emotional depth, moves gently. Pericles, with his goodly vessel riding by the island's side, near the leafy shelter that has held Marina, has reassumed the temper of Pericles in the storm. His questions are quiet, and he apologizes for his exclamation:

Thou little know'st how thou dost startle me
To call thyself Marina.¹

Step by step they move towards each other, till she is revealed as his child and the 'heir of kingdoms'.

It should be observed that there was little of this Pericles in the versions of the story most accessible to Shakespeare. The Apollonius of Lawrence Twyne's *Patterne of painefull Adventures* (1594?, reprinted 1607) is a vehement person. At his wife's death 'like a madman distracted he tore his clothes and rent his hair', and when he learns of the loss of his daughter he falls into an 'outrageous affection'. The push that the barely conscious Pericles gives to Marina is derived from a far more violent demonstration, for Apollonius 'stroke the maiden on the face with his foote, so that she fell to the ground, and the blood gushed plentifully out at her cheeke's'. If we turn to Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, as Shakespeare seems to have

¹ *Pericles*, v. i. 145-6.

done
fortu
saith
temp
the s
al res
it is
howe
whic
Ther
Twyn
inces

To T
fortu
finis
cludi
princ
endu
allow
work

Hit
textu
the w
until
enshr
of the
and c
points
Georg
Prince
tation
I shal
perf
partly
lonius

¹ Go

² Ibi

⁴ No

xlv (19

4890.

done, we find less violence but little patience. Appolinus swoons and defies fortune when his wife dies, and at his daughter's tomb 'He curseth and saith all the worst Unto fortune'.¹ There is one suggestive touch of temperance, which Shakespeare did not miss though Twyne did. When the sailors approach the grieving king with their demand, he replies: 'It is al reson that ye preie.'² He shares their belief. To Shakespeare's Pericles it is not reason but superstition, and his courtesy is the greater. Gower, however, is not concerned with patience, but with honest, well-placed love, which he is contrasting with the incest of Antiochus and his daughter. There is therefore more coherence and proportion in his story than in Twyne's and it moves logically to its moral, which is that, while the incestuous are foredoomed, there is some hope for the honest lover.

Fortune, thogh sche be noght stable,
Yit at somtyme is favorable
To hem, that ben of love trewe.³

To Twyne the attraction of the story lay in the exemplary instability of fortune. It offered him a 'delectable varietie' of strange accidents, and he finishes up with a hearty distribution of punishments and rewards, including, somewhat oddly, the knighting of the pirates who kidnapped the princess. His *Patterne of painefull Adventures* does not presume a pattern endurance, but to Shakespeare it may well have suggested one, and he allowed his imagination to fill the empty niche within the exuberant framework with figures of ideal purity.

Hitherto the suggested reading of *Pericles* has been independent of the textual problem. It could be accepted equally by the reader who ascribes the whole play to Shakespeare and the reader who does not hear his voice until Act III and only intermittently thereafter. If *Pericles* is intended to enshrine a type of patience, it does not affect the author's intention if some of the shrine is borrowed or superimposed work, or, alternatively, if time and circumstance have mutilated his own. There remain, however, two points to be mentioned which carry us into the doubts that surround George Wilkins's prose narrative, *The painefull Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre* (1608). Neither of the points is necessary to the interpretation, though both support it. For the purpose of adducing them, then, I shall assume without discussion that Wilkins's novel appeared after the performance of Shakespeare's play, and that it was based partly on it and partly on Twyne's book (partly too, perhaps, on some older play of Apollonius, now lost). The majority of scholars⁴ seem now to incline to this

¹ Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, Liber Octavus, 1059-83, 1584-5.

² *Ibid.*, 1102.

³ *Ibid.*, 2013-15.

⁴ Notable exceptions are Hardin Craig, 'Pericles and *The Painefull Adventures*', S.P. xlv (1948), 600-5, and Kenneth Muir, 'The Problem of *Pericles*', *English Studies*, xxx

view, and it opens the door to interesting speculations. The dramatic vividness of a few episodes reads like the memory of a performance, and there are fragments of verse embedded in the prose, and touches of imagery—especially Pericles' first address to his child, 'poor inch of nature'—which more than one editor has been tempted to explain as deriving from passages, later cut and lost, in Shakespeare's original play. What I wish particularly to draw attention to, however, and I do not think it has been noticed before, is that Wilkins alone among available tellers of the story emphasizes the gentleness and courtesy of Pericles. The emphasis is most marked at the beginning, where the story is more carefully and interestingly written than in the later chapters, where it trots casually to its plagiarized end. Pericles is called the 'gentle Prince' in relation both to his reading of Antiochus' riddle and his acceptance of Helicanus' rebuke. In the fourth chapter, which tells of the shipwreck, he is 'this courteous prince', 'gentle Pericles' and 'courteous Pericles'. The epithets do not rise immediately from the context, but bear witness to a superimposed conception of the hero that fades from view as Wilkins proceeds with his narrative, relying more on Twyne and finishing with a Pericles who has the bawd burnt and Cleon and Dionyza stoned. What I would suggest is that Wilkins, who hoped to catch the pence of many who had been to the play, consciously evoked in his first careful pages the bearing of Burbage in the part. He had some kind of connexion with the King's Men, who acted his play, *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, and it is pleasant to imagine that he may have seen Shakespeare at a rehearsal, instructing his fellow to 'use all gently'.

The second point is the changing of the traditional name of the hero, Apollonius, for Pericles. Since the assignment of the spangled hose in Alleyn's theatrical wardrobe to the part of Pericles is now dismissed as a forgery, it appears that it was Shakespeare that made the change, and Wilkins naturally followed him. Any writer of blank verse might be glad to get rid of a five-syllabled name that filled up half a line, if he was obliged to use it frequently, and in such circumstances the Elizabethan playwright, Shakespeare especially, was apt to take the name that lay nearest. The extraordinary collection of names at the Danish court still baffles conjecture. But Pericles has been explained as standing for Pyrocles, one of Sidney's heroes in the *Arcadia*. There are a few probable echoes of the *Arcadia* in the play, as in other plays of the period, and Sir Gerrard Herbert in the letter to Sir Dudley Carleton of 24 May 1619, in which he mentions a performance of *Pericles* at court, spells the play *Pirrocles*. This is, however, very slight support for the theory, and, as Sidney's young Pyrocles is presented as impulsive and ardent, there is no reason why

(1949), 65–83. But see Philip Edwards, 'An Approach to the Problem of *Pericles*', *Shakespeare Survey*, v (1952), 25–49.

Shakespeare should have thought of him, while the fiery intemperance of Spenser's Pyrochles in Book II of the *Faerie Queene* would keep the root meaning of the name well in view. I return to the summarily rejected claim of Pericles of Athens to be the godfather of the Prince of Tyre. Shakespeare had been reading Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* recently for his play of *Coriolanus*, and in the Renaissance editions the approximately chronological arrangement of the parallels had disposed *Coriolanus* with *Alcibiades* just after *Pericles* and *Fabius Maximus*. At a time when the moral aspect of history was so widely emphasized, it could not escape the reader that here there were juxtaposed two examples of patience and two of impatience. Surely Shakespeare, working on *Coriolanus* and knowing *Alcibiades* from his work on *Timon*, turned back the leaves to read of the two patient men? We can dismiss *Fabius Maximus*; nothing was to be had there that could not be found with much greater attractive power in *Pericles*. It is not suggested that Shakespeare modelled his hero on Plutarch's—the latter is a far more complex character, and his composure has far more of policy in it—only that Shakespeare's mind, turning from tragic impatience to the patience that saves, could have followed the clue in Plutarch, and that anyway he remembered what he had read in his book. For Plutarch stresses the patience of Pericles strongly in the two most salient positions, at the beginning and the end of the *Life*. At the beginning he tells the anecdote of the man who reviled Pericles all day and even followed him home at nightfall, and how Pericles ordered one of his slaves to take a torch and light the reviler back to his own dwelling; and at the end, summing up his qualities, he says that Pericles' nobility lay especially in this, that 'he never gave himself to hatred, envy nor choler', but had a perfect self-mastery. Plutarch knows of only one occasion when his constancy was shaken, and that was at the loss of his second son, Paralus:

Yet did he strive to show his naturall constancie, and to keepe his accustomed modestie. But as he would have put a garland of flowers on his head, sorrow did so pierce his heart, when he saw his face, that then he burst out in teares and cried amaine, which they never saw him do before all the dayes of his life.¹

Here, I think, is the 'priestly farewell' of Pericles, supplemented, perhaps, by some memory of *Fabius Maximus*, himself making the public funeral oration in praise of his dead son. There is no hint of the incident in Twyne or Gower. Here also is the one breakdown of the controlled man. In the play, the rite and the breach of the 'accustomed modestie' are separated, the unseen rite for Thaisa and the outbreak of grief at the loss of Marina, as the exigencies of the Apollonius-story and Shakespeare's conception of

¹ Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* (North's translation, London, 1631), p. 177.

his hero demanded. If, as one may permit oneself to imagine, Shakespeare passed rapidly over the factious politics in the middle of the *Life*, the anecdotes at the beginning and the end, strong in themselves, would stand out with double impressiveness. It may be an additional fragment of evidence that Cleon, the name for which he changed the Stranguilio of Twyne, also lies to hand in the same *Life*.

It sometimes happens that Shakespeare, having dealt with a theme centrally in one play, comes back to it later with modifications and in a less salient position. There is something of Falstaff left in Sir Toby Belch and of Iago in Edmund, and other likenesses and partial repetitions of character and situation could be cited. In his later romances he tried other ways of dramatizing patience. The sufferer is not always planted in the middle of the play, and he is no longer exemplary. He learns patience in penitence, as Posthumus and Leontes do, or sublimates it out of injury, as do Hermione and Prospero. Moreover, in the last three cases the process of illumination is off-stage; it takes place during a gap in the action or before it begins, and we see only its results, as in Leontes' sufferance of Paulina's goads and Prospero's relinquishment of revenge. Posthumus in *Cymbeline* holds the stage. His development is not central to the play, but he is allowed, according to the current dramatic convention, a long penitent monologue, summarizing his case. He has learnt quickly. There is nothing here of the frantic outcry of the smitten Leontes, nor of the self-destructive remorse of Enobarbus, whose soliloquy this in *Cymbeline* may perhaps recall. Posthumus' repentance is sober; it comes before he has evidence of his wife's innocence and while he still believes in her guilt, and it expresses itself in submission to the dealings of the gods. He hopes for death and invites it, but, like Pericles, he will not destroy himself. He is cheerful and courteous to his jailer, and 'blest to obey' the obscure will of the god of his vision. Like Edgar, who must not be omitted from this roll-call of the patient, he has more to do in a busy play than to smile at grief. He is a more active and various character than Pericles, but there is less room for him, and his attitudes have to be briefly delineated.

The particular strain of music that was heard at the heart of the storm in *Pericles* becomes a secondary subject in the later plays.

are
the
and
of
of
en-
nd
ter
of
ce,
ne
on
ns,
nd
he
d-
e,
he
of
t-
s
in
t,
x
e
is
n

DEFOE AND RICHARDSON ON HOMER: A STUDY OF THE RELATION OF NOVEL AND EPIC IN THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

By IAN WATT

THE early eighteenth-century novel developed at a time when the dominant system of critical values still took for granted the permanence of the established literary forms, and among them the pre-eminence of epic. A novelist trained in the orthodox critical tradition was bound to assume that any imitation of life in narrative form ought to be assimilated as far as possible to the rules of the epic which had proliferated since the Renaissance. But it is doubtful if this epic filiation was or could have been of much importance in the development of the novel. The novel is no doubt in some sense 'an epic in prose'. But the analogies are surely of too general and abstract a nature to have had any concrete effect upon the development of what is substantially a new literary genre.

This is certainly true of the rise of the novel in England. Defoe and Richardson do not concern themselves with the epic genealogy, and their work strongly suggests the novel's independence of epic theory and practice. Their unconcern is even supplemented by occasional references to the epic writers, especially Homer, which, although they do not amount to an overt rejection of the epic analogy, at least enable us to discover some of their reasons for an evident fact.

It is these *obiter dicta* on Homer with which we are here concerned; not so much for their inherent interest, as for their use in clarifying the general relationship of the early English novel to epic.

That Defoe and Richardson make no explicit repudiation of the epic model for their novels is not surprising. Defoe's classical and literary training was not thorough, and Richardson's non-existent. Any systematic dissent from traditional literary tenets, if they had wished to attempt it, which is unlikely, would have been discouraged by their inadequate knowledge. This very inadequacy is significant. André Le Breton¹ and Paul Van Tieghem² have pointed out how the novel's freedom of development in France was helped by its isolation from the *litterati* and their standards. In England, Defoe and Richardson are even more striking examples of the amateur status of the new literary form. Indeed it is surprising that they cast as much light as they do on the antipathy of novel and epic.

¹ *Le Roman français au dix-huitième siècle* (Paris, 1898), p. 3.

² 'La Sensibilité et la passion dans le roman européen du XVIII^e siècle', *Revue de littérature comparée*, vi (1926), 428.

Only their references to Homer are considered here, for two reasons. First, that these happen to be more significant than those to other epic writers. Secondly, that Homer is a more significant figure in the present context because his works were then considered to be, and are in fact, the archetypes of epic.

The topic has a further interest. It so happens that the views of Defoe and Richardson have not been noted in recent studies of eighteenth-century attitudes towards Homer and epic generally. The stated purposes of H. T. Swedener's *The Theory of the Epic in England, 1650-1800*¹ and D. M. Foerster's *Homer in English Criticism*² preclude them from dealing with the literary attitudes current among the less-educated strata of the reading public. But some attention to their views is easily justified, for it was precisely in this milieu that the new literary form began, and indeed it is likely that it could only have been there.

I

Defoe received a broad education at a dissenting academy,³ and his own writings, as well as the fact that he left a considerable library,⁴ suggest extensive and varied reading.⁵ This reading was mainly used, not for literary or critical purposes, but to provide facts for his arguments, and especially to fill out his treatises to book length when invention or memory failed. Classical authors figure mainly as sources of evidence in history, theology, and thaumaturgy. Latin poetry is not very largely represented: a few passing allusions to Horace, Ovid, and Virgil, a perfunctory eulogy of that last 'immortal',⁶ a shudder at the 'long ago exploded . . . latin bawdy Authors Tibullus, Propertius and others',⁷ a small stock of moral tags—these almost exhaust his repertoire. Of the Greek poets, only Homer

¹ Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1944.

² New Haven, 1947.

³ J. R. Sutherland, *Defoe* (London, 1937), pp. 18-22.

⁴ See George A. Aitken, 'Defoe's Library', *Athenaeum*, 1 June 1895.

⁵ Much of the evidence is presented in W. Gückel and E. Günther, 'D. Defoe's und J. Swifts Belesenheit und Literarische Kritik', *Palaestra*, cxlix (Leipzig, 1925), 23-39; W. L. Payne, *Mr. Review* (New York, 1947), pp. 5-9; and Rudolph Stamm, *Der Aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoe* (Zürich and Leipzig, 1936), which gives the best account of Defoe's intellectual outlook.

⁶ In *The Life of Mr. Duncan Campbell* Defoe compares him to Homer. But his purpose is to enhance the value of Tasso as trustworthy historical evidence for spirit manifestations: 'The famous Torquatus Tasso, prince of Italian Poets, and scarce inferior to the immortal Virgil himself, and who seems to enjoy the intermingled gifts of the most accurate judgement of this Latin poet, and the more fertile and copious invention and fancy of the Greek one, Homer, strongly asserted his own experience in this kind . . .' (Oxford, 1841, p. 86). This praise, with its conventional comparison of the two great epic writers, should not be taken as representative of Defoe's main attitude.

⁷ *Mist's Journal*, 5 April 1719; cited by William Lee, *Daniel Defoe* (London, 1869), ii. 31.

is mentioned, and all but one¹ of Defoe's references to him savour of a somewhat casual depreciation, casual because Homer's literary qualities are not specifically in question.

Defoe's earliest reference occurs in the *Review* of 2 June 1705. He is preaching political concord, and remarks that: 'It is easy to tell you the Consequences of Popular Confusions, Private Quarrels, and Party Feuds, without reading Virgil, Horace, or Homer.' This dig at the habit of using classical parallels to ornament political argument suggests a good deal of Defoe's attitude. Tradition, however hallowed, must never usurp the place of 'those two Sovereigns of Argument . . . Reason and Truth'.

Defoe's next reference is equally brief. In *The Felonious Treaty . . .* (1711), a pamphlet on the Spanish Succession, he cites a classical parallel himself to illustrate the frivolous and immoral pretexts which are so often the occasion of wars. The ten years' siege of Troy in the *Iliad* was all for 'the Rescue of a Whore'.² The view of Helen is common; but the note of impatient contempt is typical of Defoe.

Defoe's lengthy allusions to Homer occur much later, in four works of his last years.

The most extended and amusing diatribe occurs in a letter signed 'Anti-Pope' published in *Applebee's Journal*, 31 July 1725. This popular weekly—Defoe's main journalistic outlet at the time—was not normally concerned with literary matters.³ So it is not surprising that Defoe intervened in the controversy about Pope's unacknowledged collaboration with Broome and Fenton on the *Odyssey*,⁴ only to use it as an occasion for attacking his own *bêtes noires*. He begins with a coolly outrageous parallel between the ethics of literature and trade:⁵

Writing, you know, Mr. Applebee, is become a very considerable Branch of the English Commerce; Composing, Inventing, Translating, Versifying, &c., are the several Manufacturers or Employers. The several Writers, Authors, Copyers, Sub-Writers, and all other Operators with Pen and Ink, are the Workmen employed by the said Master Manufacturers, in the forming, dressing and finishing the said Manufactures; as the Combers, Spinners, Weavers, Fullers, Dressers, &c., are, in our Clothing Manufactures, by the Master Clothiers, &c. . . .

In the clothing trade, the master manufacturer obviously sells 'a medley of goods' under his own name. They come from the master weaver, who, like Pope, sells these goods 'under the Mark, and in the Name of the Master Weaver', although many of them are made by less skilful journeymen and

¹ Cited above, p. 326, n. 6.

² p. 17.

³ Sutherland, *Defoe*, pp. 242, 255.

⁴ See George Sherburn, *The Early Life of Alexander Pope* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 259-69.

⁵ Cited by Lee, *Defoe*, iii. 410.

apprentices. Both master clothier and master weaver, publisher and pretended author, are deluding the public, and it is impossible to say 'who is the greatest Cheat'.

Before applying his analogy to Homer, Defoe cannot resist the opportunity for a ramifying series of *tu quoques*. His main target is Hoadley and the *London Journal*.¹ What hypocrisy it is for Hoadley to complain of Pope's passing off other people's work as his own when he does exactly the same thing himself:

Nay, has not the Right Reverend Author Himself, who made this very complaint, his Deputy Journalist, and his supply of Operators, as Occasion requires, tho' the Labourers receive their Esteem from his own illustrious Character, and are all called his Own.

Then Defoe passes on to Steele. Even the 'late celebrated *Tatlers*' passed under his name, although it 'came out at last, when he could conceal it no longer, that he had abundance of *Aid de Plumes* under him'. Finally, as his crowning stroke, he turns to Homer himself:

But to carry this Complaint higher, a Merry Fellow of my Acquaintance assures me, that our cousin *Homer* himself was guilty of the same *Plagiarism*. Cousin *Homer* you must note was an old blind Ballad Singer at *Athens*, and went about the country there, and at other Places in Greece, singing his Ballads from Door to Door; only with this Difference, that the Ballads he sung were generally of his own making. . . . But, says my Friend, this *Homer*, in Process of Time, when he had gotten some Fame,—and perhaps more Money than Poets ought to be trusted with, grew Lazy and Knavish, and got one *Andronicus* a Spartan, and one Dr. S—l, a Philosopher of *Athens*, both pretty good Poets, but less eminent than himself, to make his songs for him; which, they being poor and starving, did for him for a small Matter. And so, the Poet never did much himself,

¹ By 'the Right Reverend Author' Defoe must surely mean Benjamin Hoadley, since his association with the *London Journal* was well known in an age when it was rare for bishops to undertake journalism [Lawrence Hanson, *Government and the Press, 1605-1783* (Oxford and London, 1936), pp. 108, 117].

This identifies the attack on Pope which Defoe is referring to as the paper signed 'Homerides' which had appeared in the *London Journal* on 17 July, two weeks before (cited by Sherburn, *Pope*, pp. 262-4). It is not likely that Hoadley wrote the article himself. Although he was an enemy of Pope, his main activities as a writer for the *London Journal* had ceased earlier in the year—the last article reprinted in the *Works*, 1773, is dated 20 March 1725.

The fact that Defoe attacks Hoadley personally does not prove anything, since his article would be even more embarrassing if 'Homerides' were actually Hoadley's 'Deputy Journalist'. Defoe had often written against 'Parson Benjamin' (Lee, i. 270-1, and *C.B.E.L.* under 1717, 1719); and the *London Journal*'s unidentified dramatic and literary commentator, 'Momus', had recently attacked Defoe, by listing among 'impertinent short Novels . . . the *Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, and the memorable *Actions of Moll Flanders*' (26 June 1725). Lee (i. 400-1), followed by Dottin (Defoe, i. 363), assumes that Hoadley wrote the attack on *Robinson Crusoe* in the *London Journal* of 4 September. That article, also signed 'Momus', was probably a retaliation for Defoe's two articles of 31 July and 7 August, themselves provoked by the attack of 26 June on Defoe's novels.

only
his o

D

pres

deri

entre

of th

com

pre

D

No

for i

Hom

so th

turer

Cust

It is

cures

Hom

for t

Defo

the s

Ho

typic

Robi

1 T

poet

Sache

equiv

name

2 S

3 H

(1713)

thoug

4 S

article

5 H

Treat

6 B

who h

forma

7 'I

against

the L

bench

Letter

... (1

only published and sold his Ballads still, in his own Name, as if they had been his own; and by that, got great Subscriptions, and a high Price for them.¹

Defoe had close precedents for this picture of Homer²—even for his presentation of him as a ballad-monger³ and for his tone of good-natured derision.⁴ But the account of Homer as a plagiary and a successful literary entrepreneur⁵ seems to have been invented by Defoe to suit the argument of the moment. And this strategy—to reduce all literary matters to their commercial equivalent—is well calculated to undermine not only the prestige of epic, but the basic premisses of Augustan culture.

Defoe's destructive purpose is made clear by his conclusion:

Now, Mr. Applebee, if my Friend be right, was not Cousin *Homer* a Knave for imposing thus upon the Grecian World. In a Word, it seems to me that old *Homer* was a mere Mr. *Pope*, and Mr. *Pope* in that particular, a mere Homer; so that there's ne'er a Barrel the better Herring, except the Master Manufacturer; who, like a Bawd to a —, knew the fraud, and imposed it upon his Customers, and has been worse than both of them.

It is exhilarating sport. Lintot, the publisher of Pope's *Odyssey*, is a procuress to the public in a deception where the poets themselves, Pope and Homer, figure only as poor wantons who cannot unaided supply the demand for their wares. The Augustans scorned Defoe as a Grub-Street hack: Defoe retaliates by dragging all the great ones of literature down to exactly the same mercenary level.

He continued the process in his letter on the following Saturday with typical cross-grained exuberance. Sir Richard Blackmore⁶ and John Robinson, Bishop of London,⁷ are glanced at, and the charge of plagiary is

¹ The only 'Andronicus' connected with Homer is Livius Andronicus, the early Latin poet whose works included an *Odissia*, a translation of Homer. 'Dr. S——' would suggest Sacheverell. But neither reference seems to be intended seriously. There had to be two equivalents for Broome and Fenton, and Defoe probably took these two ill-matched names at random.

² See Foerster, *Homer in English Criticism*, pp. 17–23, 28.

³ Henry Felton mentions, to reject, the view in his *Dissertation on Reading the Classics* (1713), pp. 22–23, and Fielding ridiculed it in *A Journey from This World to the Next* (ch. viii), though he accepted it in *The Champion* (i. 34).

⁴ See the anonymous Preface, *A Collection of Old Ballads*, vol. i (1723), p. iii, and the article by 'Momus' in the *London Journal*, 26 June 1725.

⁵ Homer was generally thought to have been poor [see, for example, *Monsieur Bossu's Treatise of the Epic Poem . . . done into English by W.J.* (1695), Sig. A 7].

⁶ Blackmore best fits Defoe's allusion to 'a Learned Poet, contemporary with Mr. Pope, who has received many Honours besides that of Knighthood for his most sublime Performances . . . '.

⁷ 'And if we recur to a late celebrated Piece, in vindication of the Orthodox Faith, against Mr Whiston, we find it suggested, that his Lordship's Chaplain had a Share in the Labour.' Whiston had engaged the polemical ardours of a good many members of the bench of Bishops: but he had made this special charge against Robinson in his *Second Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London, concerning the Primitive Doxologies* . . . (1719), p. 5. See also Whiston's *Memoirs* (1749), p. 289.

then levelled at the whole clergy: 'Reverend Fathers . . . made florid by delivering . . . the borrowed Labours of their Ancestors.' It is cant, therefore, to pretend that Pope has done anything out of the ordinary.

Defoe's main interest in the two papers is not Homer. Nor indeed is it Pope.¹ The immediate—though probably incidental—effect is rather to defend Pope from the accusations which had been made in the *London Journal* and elsewhere by showing that they applied almost universally: although Pope could have derived little comfort from the tone of the defence, a tone which is clearly irreverent to all serious literary purposes. Still, the *London Journal* is his main target. As regards Homer, Defoe's attitude is indicated partly by the fact that he placed the poet of poets on exactly the same level as 'all other Operators with Pen and Ink', and partly by the fact that with Homer alone did he *invent* a charge of plagiarism, and phrase it in terms of contemptuous familiarity. Homer certainly emerges with the most damaged reputation from the general assault.

Indiscriminate impudence was at a premium in *Applebee's Journal*, and Defoe's performance on this occasion was so well calculated to please the groundlings that it need not be taken altogether seriously as representing his own views. His next references occur in a more serious work, the *Essay upon Literature*, published in 1726, and reflect his settled opinion of Homer.

By literature, Defoe means writing. His general thesis is that the art of writing was a divine gift given by Moses which enabled man to escape from 'that most corrupting, multiplying Usage of Tradition',² that is, the primitive, 'oral History of Men and Things'.³ Unfortunately the 'Writings of the Ancients', which are our only 'foundation'⁴ for early history, are often contaminated by the fallacious and exaggerated reports of previous oral traditions. The famous 'scandals' of the ancient world would have been seen in their true and odious colours if their lives had been written down at once. Instead, their lives were turned into 'Fable and Romance' by story-tellers in whose works 'Scoundrels are made Heroes and Heroes are made Gods'.²

It is in this context that Homer occurs. His works are essential historical documents: what a pity that, despite their 'fragments of truth', they are so unreliable! 'The Siege of Troy, were it unsung by Homer,

¹ In the context of the controversy, it is perhaps misleading to speak of these articles as 'a long attack on Pope's Homer' as Sutherland does [*The Dunciad* (London, 1943), p. 437, referring only to the second letter in *Applebee's Journal*]. Defoe prefaced some quotations from Pope's *Homer*, both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, with the phrase 'these Mr. Pope expresses very well': he apparently did not regard himself as an enemy of Pope. [*History and Reality of Apparitions* (Oxford, 1840), p. 171.]

² p. 115.

³ p. 17.

⁴ p. 22.

what shou'd we have known of it?¹ But unfortunately 'even now we scarce know whether it is a History, or that Ballad-Singer's Fable to get a Penny'.¹ The last phrase echoes the one cited above; and there is no doubt which alternative Defoe prefers. His mind is made up: the *Iliad* is a Fable, and Homer is his favourite example of the corruption of historical truth among the ancients. This he states elsewhere in the *Essay Upon Literature*: '... there has been too much Fiction and Fable enter'd into the Writings of the Learned, especially their Poetical Works, as *Homer* in particular, who has sung the Wars of the *Greeks*, and the Siege of *Troy* from a Reality, into a meer fiction. . . .'²

On at least one other occasion³ Defoe links the name of Homer with his frequent references to the general tendency of the ancients to adorn truth instead of recording it reliably. This insistence on literal veracity is the key to the basic difference between Defoe and the realistic novel on the one hand, and Homer and the whole classical literary tradition on the other.

The classical literary tradition contains standards of truth and propriety which are to a considerable extent autonomous: standards which depend primarily, not upon correspondence to direct experience of life, but upon correspondence to other approved literary works. Thus in the epic, 'truth' was viewed largely as a literary problem, as subject to special literary rules which reconciled verisimilitude with the marvellous, and excused apparent immorality by interpreting it in allegorical terms. Defoe instinctively disregarded such sophistries. His originality, and indeed his greatness, derive from his single-minded, and from some points of view simple-minded, re-definition of truth which made it depend only upon literal correspondence with the experiences of Robinson Crusoe and Moll Flanders. This drastic re-definition of 'truth' made it impossible for Defoe to be influenced by literary models: in turning to view the raw details of experience, he necessarily turned away from all the available literary models.

One last aspect of Defoe's attitude to Homer, and one which is related to the general Puritan dislike of the patently fictional, calls for mention. His iconoclastic rationalism combined with his Christian outlook judges classical superstition harshly. In *A System of Magic* (1727) he explores the literature of the occult. One of his conclusions is that 'the Greeks were the most superstitious of all the Devil-worshippers in the World, worse than the Persians and Chaldeans, from whom they borrowed all the fundamentals

¹ p. 117.

² p. 22.
³ *Applebee's Journal*, 3 Feb. 1722; cited by Lee, *Daniel Defoe*, ii. 483-6; the passage is itself based upon Augustine's Epistle to Marcellinus. The unreliability of the ancients is an early theme of Defoe's: it appears in the preface to *The Storm* . . . (1704).

of their Idolatry'.¹ Ancient religious literature is vitiated by the 'infernal juggles' of the devil who 'chops in' with 'a horrid Rhapsody of complicated Idolatry' from time to time.² In another passage, too long to quote, from a similar work, the *History and Reality of Apparitions* (1727), he examines the statements of Homer and Virgil on apparitions and concludes scornfully: 'What learned Nonsense, and what a great deal of it is here, to reconcile a thing, which, upon the Christian foundation, is made as easy as anything not immediately visible to the common eye can be made!'³

Nor, indeed, is this superstitiousness rendered tolerable by any intrinsic moral purpose: for, in terms that must be read as applicable to Homer, Defoe also laments that there was 'not a Moralist among the *Greeks* but *Plutarch*'.⁴

This note of hardly concealed impatience at the irrational and immoral idolatry of the ancients is a suitable one on which to leave Defoe. Homer could have been a most valuable source of historical evidence. But—partly because of his own inveterate ballad-mongering, and partly because of the obdurate superstitiousness of the Greek civilization—he failed to make full use of his opportunities, and the truth was never told. If only Troy had had a really good journalist!

II

Richardson is like Defoe in that he does not establish any critical relationship between his dislike of Homer and his own work as a novelist. But in his later years, when the allusions to Homer occur, he was aware that his literary intentions accorded little importance to the epic. One would not expect from a man of Richardson's temperament and education the outspoken and defiant expression of distaste so natural to Defoe. Nevertheless a similar hostility can be discerned in Richardson's more cautious utterances.

His earliest reference is the most outspoken. It occurs in an undated letter, probably of 1749, to Lady Bradshaigh.⁵ She had apparently initiated a discussion in similar terms, and Richardson replied:

I admire you for what you say of the fierce, fighting Iliad. Scholars, judicious scholars, dared they to speak out, against a prejudice of thousands of years in its

¹ Oxford, 1840, p. 226. This aspect of Defoe's thought is well and fully treated in Rudolf Stamm's *Der Aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes*, pp. 168–90.

² pp. 191, 193.

⁴ *Essay upon Literature*, p. 118.

³ Correspondence of Samuel Richardson, ed. A. L. Barbauld (London, 1804), iv. 287. The letter is certainly early, as it is addressed to 'My dear Incognita', and it was placed by Mrs. Barbauld before a letter dated 16 Dec. 1749. The letter, and that of Lady Bradshaigh which provoked it, are not extant [see Alan D. McKillop, *Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist* (Chapel Hill, 1936), p. 285].

E. Poetzsche gives a useful, though not exhaustive, account of Richardson's reading in his *Samuel Richardson's Belesenheit* (Kiel, 1908).

³ Oxford, 1840, pp. 171–4.

favour
afraid
ages;
spirit
that,
blood

THE
shock
manni
essen
are al
even
the i
Hom
Volta
geste
again

THE
letter
what
altho
'I am
which
cours
The a
would
tradit

See
by th
gener
Wars
full o

¹ N

² H

³ F
1915),
admire
Eager
the Co
with a
without
or fift

⁴ W

(Lond

favour, I am persuaded would find it possible for Homer to nod, at least. I am afraid this poem, noble as it truly is, has done infinite mischief for a series of ages; since to it, and its copy the *Eneid*, is owing, in a great measure, the savage spirit that has actuated, from the earliest ages to this time, the fighting fellows, that, worse than lions or tigers, have ravaged the earth, and made it a field of blood.

The ideas in the attack are not original. Pope had written that 'the most shocking' thing in Homer was 'that spirit of cruelty which appears too manifestly in the *Iliad*'.¹ And it is obvious that, since in epic warfare is 'an essential rather than an accessory',² its moral world stands for values which are alien to all members of a peaceful urban society, and most of which are even likely to appear reprehensible to the moralists of that society. Nor was the idea that people were afraid to confess their actual feelings about Homer because of the traditional agreement to praise him, wholly new. Voltaire, in a very significant passage of his *Essay on Epic Poetry*, had suggested that few people had been able to read the *Iliad* 'without struggling against a secret dislike'.³

There are, however, some wholly characteristic touches in Richardson's letter. Richardson could lay no claim to classical learning; so he attributes what is presumably his own opinion to 'Scholars, judicious scholars', although without any particular one in mind, as is made clear by the phrase 'I am persuaded'. This indirectness is matched by the first charge itself, which is, overtly, that 'Homer sometimes nods'. But this opinion, of course, dates at least as far back as Horace,⁴ and the word used echoes his. The qualification 'at least', however, suggests that Richardson, for his part, would go a good deal further; perhaps because he stands outside that tradition of 'thousands of years in its favour'.

Secondly, the most sweeping charge, that of the 'infinite mischief' done by the *Aeneid*, is substantially new, and indeed anticipates Blake's more general accusation that '... it is the Classics ... that Desolate Europe with Wars'.⁵ Richardson's language in formulating the charge is unrestrained, full of loathing for 'the fighting fellows', and their inspirations, the epics.

¹ Note, *Iliad* iv. 75; cited by Foerster, *Homer*, p. 16.

² H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature* (Cambridge, 1936), ii. 488.

³ Florence D. White, *Voltaire's Essay on Epic Poetry: A Study and an Edition* (Albany, 1915), p. 90. 'It is very strange, yet true, that among the most learned, and the greatest admirers of Antiquity, there is scarce one to be found, who ever reads the *Iliad*, with that Eagerness and Rapture, which a woman feels when she reads the Novel of Zaida; and as to the Common Mass of Readers, less conversant with Letters, but not perhaps endow'd with a less Share of Judgement and Wit, few have been able to go through the whole *Iliad*, without struggling against a secret dislike, and some have thrown it aside after the fourth or fifth book.'

⁴ *De Arte Poetica*, 250.

⁵ William Blake, 'On Homer's Poetry' (c. 1820); *Poetry and Prose*, ed. G. Keynes (London, 1946), p. 583.

This overstrained tone is the most valuable clue we have to Richardson's own feelings on the matter: apparent impartiality about Homer himself is only an artfully reluctant prelude to an outburst of moral indignation about his effects. The reprobation is particularly significant coming from a man whose critical standards were based upon the primacy of moral purpose, upon judging the value of a work by its effect on the reader.¹

Two of the passages about Homer in *Sir Charles Grandison* are very similar in attitude to that in the letter. The first² occurs in the course of a discussion on whether there is any need for women to learn classical languages. Richardson puts admirers of Homer into two categories: foolish scholars like Mr. Walden and forward and masculine disgraces to the female sex such as Miss Barneveld, of whom Miss Byron reports to Miss Selby, in tones that echo Richardson's own ejaculatory horror to Lady Bradshaigh, that 'Achilles, the savage Achilles, charmed her'.³

It is significant that Richardson should provide Homer with such damaging support. Later, a somewhat more direct attack is made by Miss Charlotte Grandison:

But men and women are cheats to one another. But we may, in a great measure, thank the poetical tribe for the fascination. I hate them all. Are they not inflamers of the worst passions? With regard to *epics*, would Alexander, madman as he was, have been so *much* a madman, had it not been for Homer? Of what violences, murders, depredations, have not the epic poets been the occasion, by propagating false honours, false glory, and false religion?⁴

These opinions need not be Richardson's, for Miss Grandison, we know, lacks prudence and is given to 'severe rallying', of which this is an example.⁵ Nevertheless, her opinions on the dire consequences of epic poetry are Richardson's own, as given privately to Lady Bradshaigh. Even the phrase 'in a great measure' is retained. The opinion is surely given to Miss Grandison because Richardson felt that he had to be more cautious and defensive when putting such extreme and heretical statements before the public, than when agreeing with them when they had already been addressed to him by a private correspondent. That the opinion is repeated at all suggests that it is felt to be important.

Adverse criticism of classical epic because of its bad moral effects on the reader has a necessary corollary: assertion of the supremacy in the heroic

¹ See, for example, 'Preface by the Editor', *Pamela*.

² Vol. i, 'Letter XII. Miss Byron. In Continuation' (London, 1812 ed., i. 67-86).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁴ Vol. vi, 'Letter XLV. Lady G. to Miss Byron. Friday morning, Nov. 10' (vi. 315).

⁵ She goes on to 'banish . . . the poets and poetasters of all ages, the *truly*-inspired ones excepted . . . from . . . our commonwealth, as well as Plato's' (p. 316).

genre of the Christian writers and notably Milton. This topic is also discussed by Harriet Byron, Mr. Walden, and others in the first volume of *Grandison*.¹ Walden, the classically minded pedant, supports his preference for Homer by citing Addison in the *Spectator*, who 'gives but the second place to Milton, on comparing some passages of his with Homer'. Miss Byron, who obviously represents Richardson's own views, deals with this impiety in two ways. First, she argues that she can only compare Milton with Homer in translation since she cannot read Greek: and that 'If Homer is to be preferred to Milton he must be the sublimest of all writers; and Mr. Pope, admirable as his translation is said to be, cannot have done him justice'.² This is indirect enough. No concession to Pope could be less gracious than 'admirable as his translation is said to be'. The second argument is based on hearsay evidence even more difficult to controvert. Harriet Byron alleges that in a contest of a similar kind, 'the excellent Mr. Deane' cited some unspecified 'passages of sublimity' from Milton which easily convinced a supporter of Homer that 'the English poet as much excelled the Grecian in the grandeur of his sentiments, as his subject, founded on the Christian system, surpasses the Pagan'.

This view of Milton's superiority to Homer is certainly Richardson's own.³ Once, it is true, Homer receives great praise.⁴ Harriet Byron is arguing that it is possible to have a full understanding of the passions without having travelled:

why is the Grecian Homer, to this day, so much admir'd, as he is in all these nations, and in every other nation where he has been read, and will be to the world's end, but because he writes to nature? and is not the language of nature one language throughout the world, though there are different modes of speech to express it by?

Richardson, whose lack of travel was second only to his ignorance of classical and foreign languages as a stigma in the polite world of letters, was adroit in finding unchallengeable support for his literary pretensions in the camp of the enemy. Homer serves an important objective so well that he can afford to grant freely what nobody denied—the universality of the admiration accorded Homer. Milton would not have suited this particular argument, and it is the general agreement about Homer, not his own or Miss Byron's opinions, which are in question. In any case the other adverse criticisms of Homer are unaffected.

¹ See reference in note 2 above; pp. 79-80. The passage referred to by Mr. Walden is presumably *Spectator*, 279.

² This was a common complaint, echoed, for example, by Fielding in *Amelia* (bk. VIII, ch. v) '... in some places no translation at all!'

³ It is, of course, that of the christianizing moderns such as Blackmore, Dennis, Watts, and Aaron Hill; see Swedenberg, *Theory of Epic*, p. 70.

⁴ *Grandison*, i, 'Letter XXXVI. Miss Byron to Miss Selby. Friday, Feb. 24' (p. 284).

Two other general discussions of epic and the ancients in Richardson serve to amplify our understanding of his attitude.

Writing to Aaron Hill about his *Gideon. An Epic Poem*, in 1748, Richardson commiserates with Hill about the degenerate tastes of the reading public.¹ Still, they cannot be ignored:

As to your particular title to this great work, I have your pardon to beg, if I refer to your consideration, whether epic, truly epic, as the piece is, you would choose to call it epic in the title-page since hundreds who will see the title, will not, at the same time, have seen your admirable definition of the word.

Hill's definition is an extreme statement of the didactic and scriptural view of epic,² so that Richardson's assent is to be expected. But as an expert on public taste he knew that the mere word 'epic' on the title-page was likely to discourage buyers. This gives us one very strong reason why Richardson did not try to claim any filiation of his own work with epic: it was bad for sales.

A further reason is to be found in a letter written to Young in 1758 about the *Conjectures on Original Composition*. MacKillop has shown³ that Richardson was responsible for the final form of several passages, for the apotheosis of Addison, and for the general sharpening of Young's polemic in the direction of a new anti-classical hierarchy of literary values. For Richardson to include Addison as a 'great original' could not but place his own work in a more favourable light than would be accorded it by a critical scale of values dominated by the ancients. In one celebrated passage of the *Conjectures* written by Richardson this concern with his status as a writer becomes very evident:

After all, the first ancients had no merit in being originals: they could not be imitators. Modern writers have a choice to make; and therefore have a merit in their power. They may soar in the regions of liberty, or move in the soft fetters of easy imitation; and imitation has as many plausible reasons to urge, as pleasure had to offer Hercules. Hercules made the choice of an hero, and so became immortal.⁴

¹ *Correspondence*, i. 122.

² It begins 'I take an Epic Poem, then, to mean some noble Lesson in Morality, delivered under Colour of One Action, which must be illustrious and important' and proceeds to equate epic with the parables of the New Testament, but for the 'little Difference . . . in Ornament and Size' (1749, pp. 39-41). Hill did not take Richardson's advice, apparently, about his title, and only a quarter of the plan was accomplished [D. Brewster, *Aaron Hill: Poet, Dramatist, Projector* (New York, 1913), p. 166].

³ 'Richardson, Young, and the *Conjectures*', *M.P.* xxii (1925), 393-9. Richardson's letter cited below was reprinted in the *Monthly Magazine*, xlv (1818), 238-9. It is dated 26 Dec. 1758. Young used it without alteration, except for the omission of Richardson's free use of underlining for emphasis.

⁴ *The Works of the Author of the Night Thoughts* (London, 1773), v. 94.

Richardson's purpose is transparent. He is claiming that he had been an original, not by accident, like Homer, but by a deliberate rejection of previous models of narrative.¹ The new literary Hercules was probably being brave after the event, since we have no evidence of his awareness of classical models until after the completion of his masterpiece, *Clarissa*. But we must accede to part of Richardson's plea: his originality was connected, whether by accident or design, with his neglect of established literary models in favour of his own vivid awareness of life, and the unfashionable literary modes which enabled him to express it directly.

There are many other reasons why epic was unlikely to be an acceptable model to Richardson. 'The marvellous' was still accepted as an essential ingredient of epic in literary theory.² But its presence would have undone the minute and studied realism of Richardson's literary method.³ And, even more important, the moral world of epic was too masculine for Richardson, or his readers.

This is reflected in the passages cited above. Lady Bradshaigh started him upon his course against Homer: Harriet Byron and Charlotte Grandison carried it on. There was certainly little in Homer to commend him to feminine readers, except, perhaps, to mannish bluestockings like Miss Barneveld: as James Macpherson was later to say, 'Homer, of all ancient poets, uses the sex with least ceremony'.⁴

The wider contrast between modern and epic ways of life is a clue to what is probably the major reason for the inutility of epic as a model not only for Richardson but for the novel in general. There was an ever-increasing gap between the manners of heroic times and those of eighteenth-century England; so that reading Homer meant an ever-increasing effort to exclude the normal expectations of daily life—in the words of Addison, it was difficult not to feel that 'you were reading the History of a different Species'.⁵ Richardson's success, on the contrary, was achieved by bringing

¹ It is some confirmation of the personal motive here attributed to Richardson, to find that Richardson explained Dr. Warburton's view that 'the character of an original writer is not confined to subject, but extends to manner' by the latter's need to secure 'his friend Pope's originality' (*Correspondence*, ii. 56).

² See Swedenberg, *Theory of Epic*, pp. 256-7; Ethel M. Thornbury, *Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic* (Madison, 1931), pp. 132-50.

³ As Thomas Blackwell wrote in his *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (1735): 'in a well ordered state . . . we can hardly be surprised' (2nd ed., 1736, p. 26). Francis Jeffrey's review of the *Correspondence* is a representative estimate of Richardson's originality as a realist [*Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1804; reprinted in *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review* (4 vols.: London, 1844), 302-23: see especially pp. 321-2]. For Richardson's 'hate' of 'the French marvellous', see letters, cited by McKillop, *Richardson*, pp. 39-40.

⁴ *Temora, an ancient epic poem* (1763), p. 206, n.; cited by Foerster, p. 57.

⁵ *Spectator*, 209.

literature and daily life into a closer and more detailed *rappo*rt than had ever obtained before:¹ no such *rappo*rt was possible between the manners of the Homeric world and those of 'a great luxurious city' in the eighteenth century. The implications of this difference were beginning to be obvious to Richardson's contemporaries. Thomas Blackwell, for example, expressed them pointedly in his *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (1735), and drew the obvious conclusion: 'Tho' . . . your lordship may regret the Silence of the Muses, yet I am persuaded that you may join in the Wish, *That we may never be the proper Subject of an Heroic Poem.*'²

The sentiment, though perhaps not elevated, commands assent. It would certainly have received that of Richardson. For his conception of heroic virtue was one very fully accommodated to the modest possibilities of the times. The problem of creating a new and contemporary beau ideal according to Christian and middle-class needs was not new. Steele had wondered 'why the Heathen struts, and the Christian sneaks in our imagination'?³ Defoe had suggested as a solution that the real test of courage was 'to dare to be good'.⁴ In this controversy Richardson gave a model, and a maxim, which are at the opposite pole from the active and extroverted ideals of the Homeric world. The model, of course, was Sir Charles Grandison; the maxim, less well known, and perhaps not wholly representative, but nevertheless revealing, was Richardson's sedentary and suburban reflection to Miss Highmore: 'In such a world as this, and with a feeling heart, content is heroism'.⁵

III

So much for the attitude of Defoe and Richardson to Homer and to the epic model generally. An obvious gap remains. How far does Fielding prove or disprove the inutility of the epic for the novel?

The subject is too large to attempt here. But it may be useful to suggest briefly how it could be argued that the full picture of Fielding's relation to epic does not greatly modify the present thesis.

It could first be suggested that neither Fielding nor his commentators have dealt very persuasively with the theory of the Comic Epic in Prose as a guide either to the creation or to the criticism of the novels themselves.⁶

¹ See, for example, Diderot's 'Éloge de Richardson' (1761), in *Œuvres*, ed. A. Billy (Paris, 1946), pp. 1090–1104. Blackwell pointed out that to 'poetize in the higher strains' we must 'unlearn our daily way of life' (p. 25); thus epic leads the eighteenth-century poet to do the opposite of what Richardson did.

² p. 28. The identity of the lord is not made clear. The previous quotation is from p. 123.

³ *The Christian Hero* (1701), ed. R. Blanchard (London, 1932), p. 15.

⁴ *Applebee's Journal*, 29 Aug. 1724, cited by Lee, op. cit., iii. 299–300.

⁵ *Correspondence*, ii. 252.

⁶ e.g. E. M. Thornbury, *Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic* (Madison,

The qualifications 'comic' and 'in prose' remove the formula from any concrete references to other literary works. In the last analysis the formula is suspiciously like a piece of simple semantic addition, not unlike the method recommended by Mr. Potts for writing about Chinese Metaphysics: 'He read for metaphysics under the letter M, and for China under the letter C; and combined his information, sir!' Fielding does not seem to have explored the French theorists of epic and romance;¹ but much of his writing about the epic analogy resembles them in one particular²—it is more concerned with phylogeny, with claiming a respectable pedigree for an unhallowed literary genre, than with ontogeny, with explaining the nature of the genre itself.

On these grounds, then, it could be claimed that the effectiveness of the epic analogy remains to be proven even for its greatest exemplar. And although the comic epic in prose became an 'obsessive'³ phrase among later novelists much the same could be said of their treatment of it.

Finally, evidence could be brought forward to show that Fielding himself came to doubt his earlier position. In *Amelia* epic imitation is of a different type, and the theory of the comic prose epic has been jettisoned. And the preface to the *Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*, his last work, comes close to formal recantation:

But, in reality, the *Odyssey*, the *Telemachus*, and all of that kind, are to the voyage writing I here intend, what romance is to true history, the former being the confounder and corrupter of the latter. I am far from supposing that Homer, Hesiod, and the other ancient poets and mythologists, had any settled design to pervert and confuse the records of antiquity; but it is certain that they have effected it; and for my part I must confess that I should have honoured and loved Homer more had he written a true history of his own times in humble prose, than those noble poems that have so justly collected the praise of all ages; for, though I read these with more admiration and astonishment, I still read Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon with more amusement and more satisfaction.

Fielding proceeds to soften the verdict somewhat, and the purpose of

1931); F. O. Bissell, *Fielding's Theory of the Novel* (Ithaca, 1933); W. L. Renwick, 'Comic Epic in Prose', *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, xxxii (1946), 40–43. Gilbert Highet's view of the classical indebtedness of Richardson and Fielding seems much exaggerated [*The Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 340–4]. A. W. Secord gives a view similar to the present one in a review of Thornbury, *J.E.G.P.* xxxii (1933), 418.

¹ A. L. Cooke, 'Henry Fielding and the Writers of Heroic Romance', *P.M.L.A.*, lxii (1947), 984–94. Nor does he meet the criticism of the idea of the *prose* epic which was current (see Swedenberg, *Theory of Epic*, pp. 159–65; Thornbury, *Comic Epic in Prose*, pp. 59, 102–3).

² For French analogues see the examples cited by Ralph C. Williams, 'Two Studies in Epic Theory', *M.P.*, xxii (1924), 133–58, and René Bray, *La Formation de la doctrine classique en France* (Paris, 1927), pp. 347–9.

³ George Sherburn, 'Fielding's *Amelia*: An Interpretation', *E.L.H.*, iii. (1936), 2. The tenor of the article substantiates some items of the present thesis.

the passage, to defend the literal veracity proper to a Journal, involves a further discounting. Still, it is interesting that Fielding should eventually have moved so far towards the position which Defoe had expressed with so much *sans-gêne*, the position of regarding Homer as a corruptor of historical truth; have seen the contradiction between his allegiance to epic, and his no less frequently expressed desire to be a true historian.¹

Fielding excuses Homer's 'extending fact by fiction' with the plea that 'the limits of nature' were 'too straight for the immensity' of his 'genius'. But the novel could derive little profit from following Homer outside the limits of 'nature'. Instead, by restricting its attention well within them, it hit upon a new literary resource—an exploration in depth which engaged the reader in a closer scrutiny of 'nature' than had been attempted before. This closer scrutiny—the 'realism' of the eighteenth-century novel—is closely connected with sentimentalism. For this other ingredient of the novel, the analysis of sentiment, was no more warranted by classical example than was realism. The complementary distinction between the modes of epic and novel is made explicit in a letter written either by the greatest of the 'sentimentalists', Sterne, or by his forger friend William Combe:²

... I love the classics as well as any man ought to love them,—but among all their fine sayings, their fine writings, and their fine verses, their most enthusiastic admirer would not be able to find me half a dozen stories that have any sentiment in them,—and so much for that.

¹ This is documented by Robert M. Wallace, who shows that the judgement given in the preface to the *Journal* is part of a general trend in Fielding's development ['Fielding's Knowledge of History and Biography', *S.P.*, xliv (1947), 89–107].

² *Original Letters of the Late Reverend Mr. Laurence Sterne . . .* (London, 1788), p. 14. The letter is not reprinted in most editions of the letters, and notably not in L. P. Curtis (Oxford, 1933; see pp. 189, n. 2; 252, n. 13; 294, n. 1). This rejection is not necessarily conclusive. At least one reviewer found Curtis 'a little too ready to brush aside . . . Combe' (*T.L.S.*, 1935, p. 173), and some of the arguments for the inclusion of his 'Letter 126' would favour the attribution of this part of the letter to Sterne.

THE TEXT OF HORACE WALPOLE'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH HANNAH MORE

By CHARLES H. BENNETT

BETWEEN 1784 and 1796 Horace Walpole and Hannah More exchanged seventy or more letters, of which the fifty-eight that have been found were all in print by 1834 in texts prepared by Hannah More herself, Mary Berry, and William Roberts. These texts were reprinted by later editors. The Toynbees collected a few of the manuscripts and made a start towards collation and correction; more manuscripts have now been recovered for the Yale edition of Walpole. The fitting together for the first time of the two sides of the correspondence shows the misdating and rearrangement to which it has been subjected; the manuscripts show that nearly every letter underwent the refining touches of the original editors.

Having had quite different histories, the two sides of the correspondence can best be considered separately. After Walpole's death in 1797 Hannah More's letters were returned to her, in accordance with the terms of Walpole's will. One of the letters, a *jeu d'esprit* dated 'June 20, 1840', she permitted Mary Berry to print in 1798 with Walpole's letters to her, but the rest remained unpublished until her death in 1833, when her executrix, Margaret Roberts, gave them to her brother William for inclusion in his *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More*, published in 1834. Since none of the manuscripts of the letters to Walpole has yet come to light or been found in sale catalogues, it seems likely that Roberts or one of his descendants destroyed them.

In the absence of manuscripts it is necessary to make use of internal and parallel evidence to correct the arrangement of Roberts's texts. He printed what appear to be eighteen letters from Hannah More to Walpole; actually there are twenty letters or parts of letters, since in two instances he has resorted to splicing, which can readily be detected and the spliced portions approximately dated by comparison with Walpole's letters. Of the twenty, eight are either misplaced or specifically misdated, and at least seven are incomplete. Other examples of Roberts's splicing are found in his handling of letters from Walpole. Of the four Walpole letters printed in the *Memoirs*, one turns out to be an uneasy union of portions of two letters written two years apart. At the top of another letter (4 Feb. 1788) that passed through his hands, but which for some reason he did not print, he wrote, 'Not in Lord Orford's Letters [i.e. not printed in Walpole's *Works*] —ready to be transcribed.'¹ In the considerable space Walpole left, as was

¹ This is not certainly in Roberts's own hand, but the writing is not unlike the facsimile of his signature in the frontispiece to Arthur Roberts's life of him.

his custom, between the salutation and the beginning of the letter, Roberts wrote, 'Not that it is worth your acceptance and yet I should certainly, etc., etc., etc. . . . I will hope to catch you at your return.' This is apparently the beginning and end of another letter or portion of a letter which he intended to join to this one.

Before condemning Roberts too harshly we should consider that in 1834 biographical practices in dealing with documents were not what they are today, the model set by Boswell in 1791 not yet having found many imitators. It should also be considered that, although he was not a clergyman, Roberts was an even more austere Evangelical than Hannah More herself, and felt obliged to concern himself chiefly with the moral and didactic aspects of his task. His aim in writing Hannah More's biography was, he says, to 'secure her character from misrepresentation and mistake' and at the same time to 'avoid offending the feelings or delicacy of any of those whose names occur in the course of the . . . correspondence'.¹ Whether in pursuing this aim he altered the wording in her letters to Walpole, while he busied himself in altering the dates and arrangement, can only be guessed at, but it is known that he did this in other correspondences. Mr. E. M. Forster quotes a statement by Miss Marianne Thornton, who was Hannah More's god-daughter, that Roberts changed 'the recreant Knight of Devonshire' to 'the excellent and estimable Sir T. Acland', and 'I am gladerer and gladerer and gladerer' to 'I am very glad'.² Tidying up the grammar and removing a reflection upon a living correspondent were merely routine for Roberts, but it is less easy to justify such a modification of sentiment as he made in a letter from Elizabeth Carter—which, incidentally, although dated 'Deal, Oct. 29, 1789', he has spliced without comment to a letter which he has dated 'Eastry, 1789'. Miss Carter wrote, 'The heart sinks at a view of the present confusion and horrors, with which great revolutions are usually attended. Yet so it must be: for unless by the interposition of a miracle, reformations must be brought about by bad men.' In the second sentence Roberts removed the allusion to miracles, presumably on doctrinal grounds, suppressed the shocking apposition of 'revolutions' and 'reformations', and substituted 'Yet so it must be, since they are most commonly brought about by bad men'.³

In May 1797 Hannah More wrote to her sister Patty:

Lord Orford's executors, Mrs. Damer and Lord Frederick Campbell, have sent me word they will return all my letters, which they have found carefully

¹ Roberts, *Memoirs of Hannah More* (1834), i, pp. v, vii.

² E. M. Forster, *Abinger Harvest* (London, 1936), p. 236; information from Mr. Forster and Dr. Gwladys Jones.

³ Roberts, *Memoirs*, ii. 178. The original manuscript, of which the editors have been kindly provided with a photostat, is owned by Mr. and Mrs. Donald F. Hyde.

preserved. I am also applied to in form to consent to give up such of his letters to me as are fit for publication. I have told them how extremely careful I am as to the publication of letters, and that I cannot make any positive engagement; but if when I get to Cowslip Green, I should find on looking them over that any are quite disengaged of private history, private characters, etc., I probably shall not withhold those in my possession; but I am persuaded that after they are reduced as much as will be necessary, there will be little left for publication.¹

Fortunately she either changed her mind or was prevailed upon to modify her resolution, for of the thirty-seven letters from Walpole to her that have been recovered, twenty-five were printed by Mary Berry in 1798 in Walpole's *Works*, and there is no reason to think that there is a considerable number still missing. Nor are the texts, though frequently altered, much abridged.

The manuscripts of twenty-three of the letters have been examined and collated by either the present editors or the Toynbees, five of those seen by the Toynbees having again vanished. Fourteen are now in the possession of Mr. W. S. Lewis, who also has photostats of the others that have been found. The widely scattered state of the letters reflects their rather complex history. From Margaret Roberts they passed to William Roberts, who gave them with other papers to his daughter Rosa, except for at least two which he gave to a Mrs. Hodgson. Rosa Roberts gave five of them to Miss Mildred Drage and one to Mrs. Mary Macquoid; others may have passed at Miss Roberts's death to her nephew, Cecil Roberts. Those that remained were transmitted with her other papers to her niece and executrix, Elizabeth Scott, who destroyed them, as we learn from a letter² she wrote to Mrs. Toynbee on 22 November 1900: 'There was among my dear aunt's papers a collection marked H. More. I fetched it up one day and tried to decipher a few, but they came to pieces in my hands and I demolished them forthwith. I am sorry I did not preserve the fragments. There were several I think of H. Walpole's—but I have such a horror of accumulating relics', &c. The manuscripts that survived have appeared in various public sales, at Sotheby's and elsewhere, from 1877 down to 1951.

Almost all the manuscripts that Mary Berry was permitted to print in Walpole's *Works* show markings in Hannah More's hand: explanatory notes, clarification of badly written words, and the frequent alterations which she thought it her duty to make. The hand is large and painstaking, readily distinguishable from the smaller flowing script of Miss Berry, who besides respecting Hannah More's wishes has occasionally made further excisions of her own. A complete collation cannot be attempted here, but a representative sampling will illustrate Miss More's 'disengaging'.

What occurs most often is the suppression of names of persons still

¹ Roberts, *Memoirs*, iii. 22–23.

² In the possession of W. S. Lewis.

living in 1797 to whom Walpole's references were not sufficiently complimentary. Mrs. Garrick's name is expunged in a passage which alludes to her Roman Catholicism; elsewhere it is removed for no apparent reason. Joseph Priestley's name is not allowed to stand, and 'La Signora Piozzi', as Walpole sometimes calls her, is either suppressed or altered to 'Mrs Piozzi'. Fanny Burney becomes 'Miss B——', Lord Harcourt 'Lord H——', and Warren Hastings a 'nabob'. An unflattering reference (29 Sept. 1791) to 'Deborah Barbauld' becomes 'Deborah—whom you admire', lest a reader who penetrated the disguise might assume that Hannah More approved of the comment. A six-line passage (c. 10 Sept. 1789) relating to the Duke of Grafton's conversion to Unitarianism was entirely suppressed, since his identity in the context could not be concealed.

Other alterations were dictated by propriety: Walpole was not allowed to refer to a man midwife as having 'a portly hillock of which he cannot deliver himself', or to speak of Hannah More as 'an Alma Mater with dugs enough to suckle the 365 bantlings of the Countess of Hainault', or of one of her publications as a 'pregnancy', nor could he use the phrase 'incest with male ancestors'. He was not even permitted to call booksellers 'rascally' but only 'covetous'.

Another group of alterations relate to Ann Yearsley, the poetical milk-woman of Bristol, whom Hannah More and Mrs. Montagu took under their wings, but came to regret it when she proved to be proud, intractable, and, they thought, ungrateful. The quarrel that arose between the two poetesses,¹ which in 1785–6 caused a considerable stir in the literary circles of Bristol and London, by 1797 still seems to have rankled in Hannah More's memory. Since Ann Yearsley was still living, Walpole could not be permitted to refer to her slightlying as a milkwoman, a 'good thing', or 'Lactilla', but only as 'Mrs Yearsley'. On the other hand he must not over-praise her. Where Walpole wrote, 'This good thing has real talents', Miss More substituted a colourless 'This woman has talents'.² His remark, 'Seriously, Madam, I am surprised, and chiefly at the *kind* of genius of this unhappy female: I mean at the dignity of her thoughts and the chastity of her style', was curtailed after 'female'. More significant is the change she made in a paragraph in which Walpole, after thanking her for sending him Mrs. Yearsley's poems, remarked that Bristol poetry was

¹ It grew out of a deed of trust that Mrs. Yearsley claimed she had signed under pressure. See an account of it, in terms somewhat unflattering to Hannah More, by Miss J. M. S. Tompkins in her essay on Ann Yearsley in *The Polite Marriage* (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 70–81.

² This and the two following examples are taken from a letter of 13 Nov. 1784, now in the Pierpont Morgan Library. We are indebted to Mr. F. B. Adams, Jr., and the staff for their kindness in making it available to us and providing infra-red photographs of the deleted portions.

becoming more and more diamond-like, and continued, 'I have *More* reasons for thinking so, than from the marvels of Chatterton—but I will drop metaphors, lest some Hastings or Rumbold should take me *au pied de la lettre*, fit out an expedition, plunder your city, and massacre you and the milkwoman for weighing *too many carats*'. The manuscript as sent to Mary Berry read merely 'massacre you for weighing', suggesting that the nabobs would be tempted only by Hannah More's own treasures. This looks suspiciously like the jealousy with which Ann Yearsley charged Hannah More, after the break between them. The authoress of *Percy*, *The Fatal Falsehood*, and *The Bas Bleu* seems to have been unwilling even in a joke to share her poetical honours with the milkwoman whom she had been instrumental in raising to a moderate distinction.

'YES: IN THE SEA OF LIFE'

By KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

THE poem of which these are the opening words¹ has been more often singled out by critics for superlative praise than any other poem of Arnold's. Already in 1867 Swinburne could refer to it as 'the famous verses, cited and admired even by critics sparing of their priceless praise';² to Saintsbury in 1908 it is simply 'Mr. Arnold's finest poem by far'.³ In the belief that some part of the poem's power consists in its waking of echoes from our reading, and that these also lay within Arnold's reading, I have collected some of these and attempted to relate them to the poem. (Of some that have escaped notice in print I believe many readers, especially nineteenth-century readers, to have been at least half-aware.) These are presented not in any foolish confidence of completeness, or of a new illumination of the poem. I am moved partly by dissatisfaction with what has been previously written about the poem, not only with the vagueness of eulogy but often with the stated or suggested views of its themes, and with such comment as there has been on parallels and sources. The last two are found in interdependence. Sometimes a too simple view of its themes has provoked undue emphasis on a single parallel. When John Duke Coleridge in an early review⁴ charged Arnold with imitation of a passage in *Christabel*, he was under-interpreting the poem as well as (not quite disinterestedly) imputing a wrong or over-conscious motive. When Saintsbury alined the

¹ Published in *Empedocles on Etna, and other poems*, 1852; reprinted in 1853, 1854, 1857, 1869, in the *Selections* made by Arnold himself in 1878, and in all later editions of *Poems*. There is nothing to show in what year it was written. In 1849 Arnold was contemplating publishing another volume of short poems in 1850 (letter quoted by Mrs. Humphry Ward, *A Writer's Recollections*, London, 1918, pp. 42-43). The courtship of Miss Wightman in 1850 need by no means preclude the writing of a Marguerite poem in that year or later. The poem was not revised except in punctuation and title. The 1852 text is given on p. 364 below; for the titles, see pp. 357 and 362 below.

² Review of *New Poems* in *Fortnightly Review*, October 1867; reprinted in *Essays and Studies*, 1875.

³ Preface to *Pendennis* in Oxford edition, p. xxvi; cf. *Corrected Impressions* (1895), p. 153, and *Matthew Arnold* (1899), p. 30.

⁴ Of the 1853 *Poems*, in the *Christian Remembrancer*, xxvii (3 April 1854). The religious complexion of the periodical has to be remembered, as well as J. D. C.'s sense of family property. But J. D. C. was Arnold's friend and Arnold took the review with some amusement: 'My love to J. D. C., and tell him that the limited circulation of the *Christian Remembrancer* makes the unquestionable viciousness of his article of little importance' [*Letters*, ed. G. W. E. Russell (London, 1895), i. 35]. Arthur Stanley took up the cudgels on Arnold's behalf, rather on grounds of ethics and etiquette than literary criticism (*Life and Correspondence of Lord Coleridge*, i. 211-12). He says: 'I think that the passage about "the rocks" [sic] has no lineal connection with *Christabel*.'

poem with ‘the grim *Nequicquam!* of Lucretius’ and with the later ‘Strangers Yet’,¹ he was either writing loosely or over-specializing the poem’s emotional reference; when, in another place, he called it ‘simply an extension of a phrase in *Pendennis*’,² his tone has the overstatement of discovery. And (to come to recent authorities) when Lowry and Tinker in their valuable and much-used *Commentary*³ disregard this last and mention only the echoes of Coleridge and of a single phrase of Horace, and when M. Louis Bonnerot rejects both these as origins of the image (which was never claimed) in favour of a letter of Arnold’s to his sister,⁴ there seems some lack of discrimination. All these ‘parallels’, and others, are of some but varying relevance to different levels of the poem’s meaning and purpose. Looked at together they may appear more clearly, and perhaps also expose the poem more clearly. It will stand, and reward, some searching. Its single, branching image, sustained and growing from the first line to the last, the compactness and tension along with the deceptively plain statements, and the tremendous concentration of the climax make it the firmest and perhaps indeed the greatest of Arnold’s lyrics.

I

Of all earlier poets, Horace has most to do both with the poem’s inherent and its overt meaning, and has given most to its words. The echo from Horace⁵ is the stronger for being climactic in Arnold’s poem.

Who renders vain their deep desire?
A God, a God their severance rul’d;
And bade betwixt their shores to be
The unplumb’d, salt, estranging sea.

(ll. 21-24)

¹ Matthew Arnold (1899), p. 31. ‘Strangers Yet’ is by Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton; it appears in *Poetical Works* (1876), ii. 85, with the date 1865 and a note that it has been set to music by Mrs. Bernard. It expresses the commonplace sentiment that even those nearest in blood and affection are essentially strangers; the best lines, and the only ones at all near to Arnold, are:

Oh! the bitter thought to scan
All the loneliness of man:—
Nature, by magnetic laws,
Circle unto circle draws,
But they only touch when met,
Never mingle—strangers yet.

² Preface to *Pendennis*, p. xxvi; reprinted in *A Consideration of Thackeray* (London, 1931), pp. 186-7.

³ C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry, *The Poetry of Matthew Arnold: A Commentary* (London, 1940), p. 156.

⁴ Matthew Arnold, *Poète* (Paris, 1947), p. 68 n.

⁵ So far as I know, it is noted only in Lowry and Tinker, with acknowledgement to a remark of Professor Arnold Whitridge (Arnold’s grandson); but most readers of both poets must have been aware of it, and aware that the likeness extended to *deus abscidit* as well as to *Oceano dissociabili*.

neququam deus abscidit
 prudens Oceano dissociabili
 terras, si tamen impiae
 non tangenda rates transiliunt vada.

(*Odes*, I. iii. 21-24)

Further, Arnold's repetition of 'A God' recalls Horace's 'deus, deus nam me vetat' (*Epodes*, xiv. 6),¹ associable with the lines from the Ode by the idea of prohibition, though here the context is comparatively trivial and formal.² But what is given and taken from the Ode is by no means confined to the lines quoted. In their context Horace's lines imply much more of Arnold's thought. *Dissociabili* (already noticeable by its novelty) carries the more weight from its use in a poem on the parting of friends; Horace is addressing Virgil on his departure for Greece and begs the ship to carry him safely *et serves animae dimidium meae*.³ Further, in reflecting on the daring of the sailor, he implicitly compares it with the proud rashness of Prometheus and Daedalus; the tone may be half-teasing and self-teasing in relation to the occasion (he is supposed to be wishing his friend a safe voyage) but he is reflecting seriously upon desperate endeavours, unconquerable human aspirations. Thus Horace touches each verse of Arnold's poem, including the lines which express most clearly the vain but deep desire of the isolated individual to communicate with others. Arnold says man's desire is vain, Horace that the divine ordinance is vain if man defies it; but Arnold has not really reversed Horace's emphasis on man's defiance, for Horace is partly ironic. The Ode as a whole leaves him looking at least with detachment at Jove's thunderbolts and man's impiety.

Neququam, hardly articulated, overhangs Arnold's whole poem. Is it also, as Saintsbury implied, the more deeply reverberating *neququam* of

¹ Noted by Archibald Y. Campbell, *Horace* (London, 1924), p. 143 n. The Carlyle passage noted below (p. 353, n. 1) also contributes something to Arnold's emphasis.

² That Horace's *Oceanus circumvagus* (*Epodes*, xvi. 41), in conjunction with *beata petamus arva divites et insulas*, was the starting-point for Arnold's image in the first line, as recently suggested by Paul Turner ['Dover Beach and *The Bothie*', *English Studies*, xxviii. 6 (December 1947), p. 176], seems to me more dubious; I can believe that it was in Arnold's mind, and that at any time between 1848 and 1850 this Epode would have had many special meanings for himself and Clough (Mr. Turner notes that the lines head the ninth section of *The Bothie*); but not that anything in the image or words of 'Yes: in the sea' is taken from them. Horace uses *circumvagus* for the encirclement of the whole earth by the sea. Mr. Turner points especially to l. 5, but the intimate connexion between the sea and the islands seems to me lacking for Horace; his word implies nothing of the close particular embrace of 'enclasping flow'. I should put this 'parallel' in the 'salmons-in-both' category.

³ Line 8. Cf. Arnold's

So far apart their lives are thrown

From the twin soul that halves their own.

('Too Late', ll. 3-4, also in 1852 volume.)

Lucretius—the futility of man's striving and protesting against things as they are, and the special futility of the lover's hope of happiness?

nequiquam, quoniam medio de fonte leporum
surgit amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angat¹

or, more specifically,

nequiquam, . . .
nec penetrare et abire in corpus corpore toto:
nam facere interdum velle et certare videntur.²

For all his interest in Lucretius,³ I do not believe that Arnold intended to express precisely what Saintsbury calls 'that function of the riddle of the painful earth', and Saintsbury's own previous comment, 'the poet's affection—it is scarcely passion—is there, but in transcendence; he meditates more than he feels', itself defines a difference. Arnold's meditation is on the common human lot, which not even lovers can escape. The *amari aliquid* adds only extra saltiness to the sea. And the sea is at the same time the sea of life; it is not simply ironic to call its flow enclasping; what divides is itself consoling ('fold closely, O Nature, thine arms round thy child').⁴ The 'vain . . . desire' may include, deep in the roots of the poem, the desire 'penetrare et abire corpus in corpore toto', but in the poem includes it only as the greater includes the less. To point the distinction by means of Sir Thomas Browne:

United souls are not satisfied with imbraces, but desire to be truly each other; which being impossible, their desires are infinite, and must proceed without a possibility of satisfaction.

It is the soul which suffers, the desire to communicate that is frustrated. If the more specialized meaning is suggested, it is I think the reader's doing; to most readers it would probably not even occur. To say that Arnold is not writing particularly for or about lovers may be open to question; to say that he is not writing particularly about passion frustrated in the moment of fulfilment is put beyond question by the island-image itself.

If the poem as written bears any trace of Lucretius, it is in the word 'salt' in the last line (*amari aliquid*), and this is much fainter than the trace of Horace in 'estranging'. The line, and each word of it, is locked into Arnold's context; 'estranging' carries far more emotional weight here than does Horace's *dissociabili*. Both are thinking of the actual sea that parts friends as well as islands, but only to Arnold does the sea between islands stand for the separateness of all friends—all men—as distinct from only those geographically parted. What 'estranging' also owes to the equally weighty

¹ *De Rerum Natura*, iv. 1133-4.

² *Ibid.*, iv. 1110-12.

³ See *Commentary*, pp. 292-7.

⁴ 'Parting.'

'unplumb'd'¹ and 'salt' which adjoin it is beyond calculation. Richard Holt Hutton, a perceptive and neglected critic, and one of the few who has not merely called the line Arnold's greatest (in those or other words), has suggested something of it:

Without any false emphasis or prolix dwelling on the matter, it shadows out to you the plunging deep-sea lead and the eerie cry of 'no soundings', it recalls that saltiness of the sea which takes from water every refreshing association, every quality that helps to slake thirst or supply sap, and then it concentrates all these dividing attributes, which strike a sort of lonely terror into the soul, into the one word 'estranging'.²

Within this great achievement there is included the smaller but still rare one of felicitous and exact translation; and at first sight one might think that when John Conington used 'estranging main' in his verse translation of Horace's Odes in 1863 he was simply setting the seal of approval on Arnold's own choice of word.³ But the currency of felicitous translation is partly, even largely, an oral one; and by chance the evidence survives that this choice of word was made by one who taught both Arnold and Conington.

There is one characteristic of [Tait's] teaching which must not be passed over, and that was his power of selecting more than usually spirited and appropriate English words as the equivalents of those employed by the Greek or Latin author who was the subject of the lesson. That well-known old pupil of his, Mr. E. A. Scott,⁴ who was for thirty-six years a Rugby master . . . dilated more than once to his School House pupils in the early sixties on this power of his old master. After the lapse of forty-five years only one or two of those felicitous translations remain 'in the cobwebby corner of memory's bin'. . . . Another was the translation of 'dissociabili Oceano' . . . by 'with the estranging main', the very words which Conington, who was himself in the Sixth Form under Tait for at least a year,⁵ subsequently employed in his translation of the Ode referred to.⁶

Arnold was not, of course, a sixth-former under Tait, having left school in 1841; but the years in which Tait was Tutor of Balliol (1835-42) included Arnold's first year as an undergraduate.⁷ It is, of course, not

¹ In Donne's *Sermons*, XXXVII, is 'a bottomless Sea which no plummet can sound'.

² *Literary Essays*, pp. 335-6 in 1900 edition; first appeared in 1871.

³ The Loeb editor, C. E. Bennett, also adopts it.

⁴ Edward Ashley Scott, master from 1859 to 1895, at school 1842-8. This is the Scott who, with J. C. Shairp, then a master, visited Clough's Highland reading-party in 1847 [W. Knight, *Principal Shairp and his Friends* (London, 1888), p. 106].

⁵ He left Rugby for Oxford in 1843.

⁶ S. Selfe, *Chapters from the History of Rugby School* (Rugby, 1910), pp. 83-84.

⁷ Arnold (who had approved of his appointment to Rugby) also taught the lower fifth form under him for a few months from December 1844 to April 1845, in the interim between his examination and the award of the Oriel fellowship, and possibly again for a short period in 1850.

entirely impossible that Arnold suggested to his tutor the word which Tait afterwards passed on to his Rugby sixth-formers; but the probabilities are in Tait's favour, and a minute fraction of the praise Arnold has received for his great line might be transferred to the credit of the most versatile of Victorian archbishops.

II

Arnold's first verse contains a general statement about the conditions of human existence—'we mortal millions live *alone*'. The first verse is not, then, about those who long to be together when apart, or who when not parted long to be more together; it is not even only about each individual's personal loneliness; it is about the isolation of 'mortal millions', the vast sum of isolations. The image is not of two islands (and I do not think it narrows itself into that even in later verses), or of a group of islands, but of all the islands in the sea, 'dotting the shoreless watery wild'. 'All men are isolated'; that sentiment is too 'natural', too little 'new', for its long history and countless variations to add to or reveal anything in the poem. The famous sentence in Donne's *Devotions* varies by explicit contradiction: 'No man is an *Island*, entire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the *Continent*, a part of the *Maine*'.¹ I shall not venture into the question whether this variation is more typical of Donne's century and Arnold's of his, nor do I believe it would be rewarding; Arnold and his contemporaries, even more than Donne and his, though perhaps on a different level, showed that they felt themselves 'involved in mankind'; and affirmation, questioning, and contradiction of man's island nature are but different faces of the same thought. Still in a Christian context, that thought appears in a poem from that volume which all Victorians knew in childhood or youth, *The Christian Year* of John Keble, Arnold's godfather:

Why should we faint and fear to live alone,
 Since all alone, so Heaven has will'd, we die,
 Nor even the tenderest heart, and next our own,
 Knows half the reasons why we smile or sigh?
 Each in his hidden sphere of joy or woe,
 Our hermit spirits dwell, and range apart. . . .²

To Keble this separateness is a necessary part of the imperfect human condition, not to be regretted since it makes man aspire to heaven. To others it was simply necessary and to be accepted:

When I spoke of myself as an island, I did not mean that I was so exceptionally. We are all islands—

¹ *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624), xvii.

² Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity.

Each in his hidden sphere of joy and woe,
Our hermit spirits dwell and roam apart

—and this seclusion is sometimes the most intensely felt at the very moment your friend is caressing or consoling you. But this gradually becomes a source of satisfaction instead of repining.¹

These are not offered as parallels; though there is certainly a real affinity between Arnold and George Eliot, and it is not surprising to hear from Arnold himself in 1876 that she said 'that of all modern poetry mine is that which keeps constantly growing upon her'.²

But there are two nearly contemporary elaborations of the idea which were likely to have been half-consciously recalled by Arnold and by many of his early readers; indeed, they illustrate one current in that 'main movement of the mind of the last quarter of a century' which he said in 1869 he believed his poetry to represent.³ Two of the many different directions in which the notion of general isolation could be slanted are represented in Carlyle's *Past and Present* (1843),⁴ and Thackeray's *Pendennis* (1849);⁵ the one resentful of the isolation of workers and masters in modern society; the other exposing with rather more bitterness than compassion the real isolation of the domestically intimate. Carlyle speaks of isolation and Thackeray also of islands; but in both passages it is the momentary poetic quality and the picturesque suggestions that bring them into contact with the poem. With Carlyle there is also his emphatic rejection of divine agency, which may help to account for Arnold's equally emphatic assertion of it.

In his final Book, the 'horoscope' of the future, Carlyle is appealing against industrial anarchy to the 'captains' who must arise; against the formal tie of cash payment to the closer bond of love and loyalty such as the feudal baron knew:

It was beautiful; it was human! Man lives not otherwise, nor can live contented, anywhere or anywhen. Isolation is the sum-total of wretchedness to man. To be cut off, to be left solitary: to have a world alien, not your world; all a hostile camp for you; not a home at all, of hearts and faces who are yours, whose you are! It is the frightfullest enchantment; too truly a work of the Evil

¹ J. W. Cross, *George Eliot's Life* (London, 1884), p. 167 of 1892 ed.; letter of May 1854, written to Mrs. Bray just before she left the country with Lewes.

² *Letters*, ii. 126.

³ *Letters*, ii. 9; letter to his mother.

⁴ The parallel with Carlyle has not been noted before. Arnold's Oxford generation (that of *Tom Brown at Oxford*) were particularly enthusiastic about Carlyle. The earliest letter we have from Arnold to Clough (1845; *Letters to Clough*, p. 55) is partly in Carlylese. Arnold and Clough visited Carlyle together in June 1848 (*ibid.*, p. 16).

⁵ Published in numbers, 1848–50; chapter xvi appeared early in 1849. This likeness was noted by Saintsbury (loc. cit.), and independently by J. T. Hackett, *My Commonplace Book* (London, 1919), p. 266. Mrs. Sells accepts it (from the latter source) in her article 'Marguerite', *M.L.R.*, xxxviii (1943), p. 294, n. 1.

One. To have neither superior, nor inferior, nor equal, united manlike to you. Without father, without child, without brother. Man knows no sadder destiny. 'How is each of us', exclaims Jean Paul, 'so lonely, in the wide bosom of the All!' Encased each as in his transparent 'ice-palace'; our brother visible in his, making signals and gesticulation to us;—visible, but forever unattainable: on his bosom we shall never rest, nor he on ours. It was not a God that did this; no!¹

Carlyle's general argument has little connexion with this poem, though much with Arnold's later development; but when he speaks of 'isolation' he passes beyond the socially unhealthy separateness of men in industrial England to imply a separateness still more terrible, because less curable. The quotation (a favourite with Carlyle)² from Richter, the change to the first person, extend his reference from the 'condition-of-England question' nearer to Arnold's 'mortal millions'; 'the wide bosom of the All' touches the 'enclasping flow'; and Arnold counters, even in reiteration, Carlyle's 'It was not a God that did this; no!' (Not that 'a God' means the same to both writers.) But nearest of all to the poem is Carlyle's poignant and 'romantic' image for frustrated communication (an image set going by the word 'enchantment') of our brother man in his transparent ice-palace, making signals 'visible, but forever unattainable'; arousing, that is, a 'longing like despair'. Arnold (not necessarily in this verse, but in his half-conscious recollection of the whole passage) has responded, as he so often does,³ to the poet in Carlyle. Often as he might contend, in the sphere of fact and policy, against the particular recommendations of this 'moral desperado',⁴ he could have said at any time of his life what he writes to Clough in 1848, 'it is the style and feeling by which the beloved man appears'.⁵

And now Thackeray. The immediate excuse for his general statement of human isolation is trivial enough: it is Mr. Smirke's disappointment at losing Pendennis as a pupil, and losing therefore his one outlet for his secret and absurd adoration for Helen Pendennis. The comic irony of the curate's preoccupation with his own feelings, in the midst of the larger disquiets of his superiors at the moment of Arthur's launching on the world, inspires Thackeray to remind the reader, with ample and disturbing satiric detail, how little the members of any household really know of each other's thoughts. After exposing in turn son, daughter, and grandmother, he concludes:

¹ Book IV, chapter iv; p. 367 in edition of 1843.

² See the essay 'Jean Paul Friedrich Richter again' (1830), in *Miscellanies* (1839); iii. 72 of 1869 edition.

³ And as he did to the sentence in the previous chapter (IV. iii), 'Much lies among us, convulsively, nigh desperately, struggling to be born', and to a great deal in *Sartor*.

⁴ *Letters to Clough*, p. 111.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

And as for your wife—O philosophic reader, answer and say—Do you tell *her* all? Ah sir—a distinct universe walks about under your hat and mine. All things in Nature are different to each: the woman we look at has not the same features, the dish we eat from has not the same taste to the one and the other. You and I are but a pair of infinite isolations, with some fellow-islands a little more or less near to us. Let us return, however, to the solitary Smirke.

For a moment the button-holing address to the reader modulates into soliloquy. Upon the rather shabby area of family life in which Thackeray's investigations have previously been moving, uncovering secrets, raising suspicions ('settling like a meat-fly'), there breaks, in that one sentence, a sudden shaft of insight; its very unexpectedness and brevity take the eye and the memory. Unexpected, for it is not led up to; Thackeray's people are not trying to communicate, not does he suggest that they should; they are each other's dupes, and until this point the fact has seemed mainly to amuse him. Still, into that one sentence so much suggestion is packed that we could well assume (with the closeness of date) that it was among the later, more immediate stimuli of Arnold's poem. This is still far from saying with Saintsbury that the poem is 'simply an extension' of Thackeray's sentence; for Arnold says much more.

III

Arnold's islands were not always islands. 'For surely once, they feel, we were | Parts of a single continent.' Here what might appear a 'stock' development disguises complicated associations and echoes. When we read these lines (and the bleakly straightforward manner of the first claims a different kind of attention from the nightingale-moonlight lines and the 'longing like despair') we may be not wholly satisfied with the 'balance or reconciliation . . . of the idea with the image'. This longing for unity may be something that 'we mortal millions' feel; is it important to the poem that they should feel it? First, what is that 'once' for which they desperately long? It would be too trivial (for the poem) if it were no more than a happier period in the individual's life or love; this is the longing of all islands, of mortal millions. I think we can exclude, too, the 'historic' past of Carlyle's social thinking, and also of Arnold's own later 'Dover Beach' and 'Obermann once more' ('the sea of faith | Was once too at the full' . . . 'the past, its mask of union on'). In the Platonic 'Self-deception' Arnold wrote of a further, an absolute, past, out of time; men 'claim the glory | Of possessing powers not our share' because 'before we woke on earth, we were', desiring the 'treasures of God'; but a Power beyond our seeing 'staved us back, and gave our choice the law'; 'decided | What the parts, and what the whole should be'. 'Before we woke on earth' is most likely to be the poem's

'once', and the natural association with other poetry is perhaps with Wordsworth's 'native continent' from which men's spirits cross by an isthmus to earth and human life.¹ Or more vaguely, with the poetically (and philosophically) commonplace equation of island = man's life (the part, the Many); continent = God, 'Nature' (the whole, the One).² That is, the separation hinted in 'parts of a single continent' is that of creature from creator. No particular passage need be even at the back of Arnold's mind; but some lines that may have fastened on his imagination occur in Browning's *Christmas Eve*.³ Browning sees the creator as standing 'a hand-breadth off, to give Room | for the newly-made to live'; man's separateness in receiving his gift of reason is his privilege and opportunity—

Man, therefore, stands on his own stock
Of love and power as a pin-point rock,
And, looking to God who ordained divorce
Of the rock from his boundless continent

—recognizes the kinship between his own love and power and this manifestation of God's love and power. Removed though Browning's whole intention is—his poem is a hammering out of his personal faith, Arnold's poem only faintly brushing against problems of belief in its passing—in their mode of expression the two poets seem here to touch. The common element of meaning is a divinely enforced separation imaged in the contrast between continent and tiny island ('dotting' the sea; 'pin-point rock'); and Browning's poem as a whole also emphasizes the individual's isolation from his fellows and his need to share and communicate ('For I, a man, with men am linked . . . no gain | That I experience must remain | Unshared'). This and the poem's other themes are a reminder that it was likely to interest Arnold in 1850, even had he not with Clough been an interested (and critical) reader of Browning before that date.⁴

The relation of Arnold's lines to this area of meaning (whether he recalled Browning or not is a side-issue) leaves them, perhaps, still unsatisfying. The non-human forces in the poem raise almost too great a variety of suggestions. The sea of life with its 'enclasping flow' ('water as the Mediator between the inanimate and Man')⁵ suggests the mysterious, infinite, im-

¹ *Prelude*, v. 536-8.

² Wordsworth's image is of two continents, with the emphasis on separation by distance, difference, and time, not by severance; Young's in *Night Thoughts*, iv ('From Nature's continent, immensely wide, | Immensely blest, this little Isle of Life, | This dark, incarcерating Colony | Divides us'), is obscure as an image, but presumably implies the same general notion.

³ Published 1 April 1850.

⁴ *Letters to Clough*, p. 97. The letter is undated, but probably not long after September 1848. Arnold's knowledge of *Christmas Eve* is suggested by a much later echo, in 'Obermann once more' (cf. part xi).

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 92 (letter from Switzerland, September 1848).

penetrable; 'a God, a God', in so far as he is more than Horace's *deus*, suggests the arbitrary and uncompassionate.¹ But these conceptions are poetically and triumphantly united in the central irony of the poem by the last line; the enclasping sea, the echoing straits are *also* unplumb'd, salt, and estranging. The idea of the 'single continent' is comparatively unintegrated. It demands more connexion with the other 'unknown Powers' than it fulfils; its assertiveness seems to claim an intellectual assent to a continuous meaning on all levels which is not completely there.

IV

As a mere statement about geographical islands, the lines are fully acceptable. Granted that islands could feel, they would be correct, even up to date, in feeling they were once part of a single continent; the reader of 1852 who had been brought up on Lyell could accept the statement as a scientific one. But this kind of association and appeal are not commonly Arnold's concern in the way they are Tennyson's. If he desired any association it was with the legendary, poetic tradition as formulated, for instance, in Collins's 'Ode to Liberty'. There is here no plainly verbal contact, but to my mind there is a vital connexion with at least one of Arnold's underlying meanings.

Beyond the measure vast of thought,
The works the wizard Time has wrought!
The Gaul, 'tis held of antique story,
Saw Britain link'd to his now adverse strand;
No sea between, nor cliff sublime and hoary,
He pass'd with unwet feet thro' all our land.
To the blown Baltic then, they say,
The wild waves found another way,
Where Orcas howls, his wolfish mountains rounding;
Till all the banded West at once 'gan rise,
A wide wild storm ev'n Nature's self confounding
With'ring her giant sons with strange uncouth surprise.
This pillar'd earth so firm and wide,
By winds and inward labours torn,
In thunders dread was push'd aside
And down the should'ring billows borne.
And see, like gems, her laughing train,
The little isles on ev'ry side!
Mona, once hid from those who search the main,
Where thousand elfin shapes abide,

¹ As in 'I hear a God's tremendous voice, "Be counsell'd, and retire!" Ye guiding Powers, who join and part' ('The Lake'); cf. 'the Powers that sport with man' ('Destiny').

And Wight, who checks the west'ring tide;
 For thee consenting Heav'n has each bestowed,
 A fair attendant on her sov'reign pride:
 To thee this blest divorce she ow'd,
 For thou hast made her vales thy lov'd, thy last abode!!

Little more here in common, it would seem, than the tradition of two lands, once united, now separated, with the multitude of 'little isles' as a decorative adjunct. But the lands are Britain (with her 'attendant train') and the mainland of Europe; Collins's note² supports the tradition by arguments 'from the correspondent disposition of the two opposite coasts'. For Collins's purpose of saluting Liberty in a patriotic poem of 1747, the separation is a 'blest divorce' (a sentiment which could have been thought timely in 1848-50);³ to Arnold it was for his personal life a matter only for regret. For, of course, entwined with his sense of isolation of all islands and all mortal millions is his awareness of himself, on his own native island, and of the estranging sea between himself and France and Switzerland, both for all they symbolize to him, and for their connexion with the poem's recipient. This is a 'Switzerland' poem.⁴ It is headed 'To Marguerite' in the editions of 1853 and 1854, 'To Marguerite, continued' in 1869 and thereafter, and on its first appearance in 1852 had a title of Wordsworthian precision, not paralleled elsewhere in the volume—'To Marguerite, in returning a volume of the Letters of Ortis'. Particular hypotheses about when and where Arnold wrote the poem are here immaterial (what we know of his habits of composition does not warrant the tying up of any poem's writing to a single time or place); but wherever or whenever he returned that borrowed volume, the notion of an actually separating sea, past, present, or to come, must have been in his mind. He is thinking, as in other poems,

¹ 'Antistrophe', 64-88 [*The Poems of William Collins*, ed. Walter G. Bronson (Boston, 1868)]. Collins believed himself the first to make poetical use of this tradition. But cf. Drayton, *Poly-Olbion*, Song xviii, and Selden's note.

² On l. 67. His further note on l. 81 supplies an independent cobweb thread connecting the lines with Arnold; for it records the legend of a mermaid off the Isle of Man who fell in love with a beautiful young man who deserted her, whereupon she hid the island in enchanted mist as a revenge. This has not been previously noted in connexion with 'The Forsaken Merman', though the latter poem has been related to the Arnolds' visit to the Isle of Man in the summer of 1845 (where he wrote 'The Gipsy Child') and some of the still current mermaid-legends cited, in Penelope Fitzgerald's 'Matthew Arnold's Summer Holiday', *English*, Summer 1946, pp. 77-81. This further link with the note may have tied the poem more firmly to Arnold's memory.

³ As by 'the Tory member's eldest son' in *The Princess* (lines added in 1850 edition): 'God bless the narrow seas! I wish they were a whole Atlantic broad.' (The Atlantic was broader then.)

⁴ It was included in the group so entitled as soon as that group was formed (in *Poems*, 1853) and never left it, though its number in the series and its title were several times altered.

of several modes of separation; but the geographical is at least among them.¹ The idea is deeply in the image; Arnold's poem, like Horace's ode, is in part about an actual sea separating himself and another. Such a sea can indeed hardly be looked at or thought of without suggesting something that is not sea; the particular sea of the Straits of Dover is not as definitely present in this poem as in 'Dover Beach'; but the titles, and especially the original title, make it a necessary part of what we receive. And lines 15-18 are the clearest reminder of it, whether or not the link with Collins's ode is a true one.

v

With personal separation (not of *all* mortal millions but of Arnold and another or others) in mind, consider again the associations of 'estranging'. The common colloquial sense of 'estrangement' is not to be overlooked. That other kind of separation or isolation underlies the poem, although no one line exposes it, and it is clearest when we think of the poem not alone but as part of the whole constellation of 'Switzerland' and allied poems. That is, the parting of friends that comes from 'growing apart'. The image of lands once united and now divided touches common speech here; we speak of a rift or a gulf. It is for this separation, or rather for its extreme cases (a quarrel, a misunderstanding, caused by slander), that Coleridge used a similar image:

Alas! they had been friends in youth;
 But whispering tongues can poison truth;
 And constancy lives in realms above;
 And life is thorny; and youth is vain;
 And to be wroth with one we love
 Doth work like madness in the brain. . . .
 They parted—ne'er to meet again!
 But never either found another
 To free the hollow heart from paining;
 They stood aloof, the scars remaining,
 Like cliffs which had been rent asunder;
 A dreary sea now flows between;—
 But neither heat, nor frost, nor thunder,
 Shall wholly do away, I ween,
 The marks of that which once hath been.²

John Duke Coleridge³ charged Arnold with imitating these lines, not in 'manner' but in 'thought'; 'would they [Arnold's lines] have been

¹ As in 'Parting' (1852).

² See p. 346, n. 4 above.

³ *Christabel*, ll. 408-13, 418-26.

written but for the famous passage in *Christabel*?¹ The question (even apart from the general issues it raises) could not be answered with the expected negative unless we thought that this kind of estrangement was the main theme of Arnold's poem, which is impossible. But there is a connexion; it may be partly dependent on the connexion with Collins's ode (does Coleridge recall its 'no sea between, nor cliff', its wild storm, wrenching the lands apart?) but it lies more in the sense of hopelessness and tediousness in severance—

A dreary sea now flows between

The unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea.

Coleridge's objective statement of the old breach between Sir Leoline and Sir Roland de Vaux is here sharpened, troubled, elaborated by his own consciousness of misunderstandings with friends; his poem at this point is not simply narrative, any more than Arnold's is simply a general reflection. The ghost of 'I' and 'you' vexes the detached 'we' and 'they'.

The implied 'you' is not only Marguerite. Several passages in Arnold's letters in years around 1850 speak of, or suggest, a growing apart from those nearest to him. 'As I become *formed*', he writes to his sister Jane in January 1851, 'there seems to grow a gulf between us, which tends to widen till we can hardly hold any intercourse across it.'² Something of the same feeling affected his relation with Clough in the years between 1849 and 1853; the admissions in the letter of 1853 confirm part of what can be read between the lines in earlier letters, and partly explain the curious blank in the latter half of 1850.³ Clough's phrasing in his letter of June 1849, 'Our orbits

¹ An indication of how famous it was is found in a letter from Jane Carlyle to William Allingham, in the early 'fifties: 'For years and years we [the Carlys and Mill] have "stood apart like rocks, &c. &c. &c." (I forget the quotation in spite of reading it anew in every young lady's thrilling novel).' [Letters to William Allingham, ed. H. Allingham (London, 1911), p. 141.]

² Letters, i. 14. Jane Arnold had married W. E. Forster on 15 August 1850; Arnold was engaged, and married in June 1851. Bonnerot, p. 68 n., links the passage with the poem. But he does not (p. 69) distinguish sufficiently between this image and that of the separate course of ships. The latter image Arnold frequently used (e.g. in 'Human Life', 'The Future'), and used, for separation and perhaps estrangement, in two other 'Switzerland' poems ('A Farewell', 'The Terrace at Berne'; compare Clough's 'Qua cursum ventus', written with W. G. Ward in mind in 1845). The movement of ships and the sense of temporal change make this an essentially different image. Islands can never meet again and ships can.

³ The one surviving letter (Letters to Clough, p. 116) suggests that they had not known of each other's doings for some months. Clough had been in Venice (and writing *Dipsychus*), Arnold abroad on a journey of which nothing is known except that he was 'not . . . at Geneva', as Clough had expected, and that he followed Miss Wightman to Calais ('Calais Sands' is dated in the MS. 'August 1850') and went on to the Rhine. (See Lowry and Tinker, pp. 116-72.) This is the biggest and most important gap in our knowledge of Arnold's life in his writing years.

therefore early in August might perhaps cross and we two serene undeviating stars salute each other once again for a moment amid the infinite spaces',¹ half mocks their essential solitude and independence. The phrase anticipates Arnold's in 'A Farewell'; when, after this life, the 'true affinities of soul' appear, 'then we shall know our friends' and 'may to each other be brought near | And greet across infinity'. There is estrangement in the same poem, as in 'We were apart', and in 'Parting',²

a sea rolls between us
Our different past . . .
Far, far from each other
Our spirits have grown;
What heart knows another?
Ah, who knows his own?

But these others are more simply poems of the *heart*, striving to know itself and another; the special attraction and frustration they express affect 'Yes: in the sea' only in so far as it is one of a series of poems. The exclusion of 'I' and 'you' (as of the mountains and lakes of Switzerland) points its impersonality; in this it is unique in the series. 'The unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea' belongs nearly as much, and as little, to Arnold and Clough, Arnold and his sister, even possibly to Arnold and Fanny-Lucy, as to Arnold and Marguerite; quotations from the letters and other poems near in date show that the inevitability of estrangement was playing upon his mind from more than one direction.

VI

One kind of isolation that the poem surely never suggests is that of the romantic outlaw, wanderer, exile from and enemy of society. Its meaning seems removed from the Werther-ish sphere represented by the Letters of Ortis named in the original title. (It is doubtful if any reader would relate Foscolo's work to the poem³ at all but for that title. Arnold never elsewhere mentions author or work, nor have they ever been accounted an influence on his thought.) It has its own limited relation to the poem, simply as being the story (told mainly in letters) of a man peculiarly isolated, by

¹ *Letters to Clough*, p. 108. The orbits did not cross that year because Arnold chose to remain at Thun.

² 1852, but at least partly written by September 1849.

³ In fact no one to my knowledge has even referred to it, apart from Mrs. Sells [Matthew Arnold and France (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 101-2] and a passing reference by Saintsbury suggesting that 'Ortis' may have been a common source for Thackeray and Arnold. See also Isabel Macdonald's 'novel' about Arnold, *The Buried Self* (London, 1949).

political circumstances and by temperament. The few reflections Ortis makes upon his isolation, however, are not and could never be Arnold's: l'homme, ouvertement ou en secret, est toujours l'implacable ennemi de l'humanité.¹

chaque homme naît ennemi de la société, parce que la société est ennemi de chaque individu.²

Je suis donc obligé de revenir à cette affreuse vérité, dont l'idée seule me faisait frissonner autrefois, et que depuis je me suis habitué à méditer et à entendre avec tranquillité, 'Tous les hommes sont ennemis'.³

No farther than this does Ortis generalize his own unhappy fortunes; and this is not Arnold's direction, either in this poem or elsewhere.⁴ Nor could the attraction of Foscolo for Arnold be inferred from that of Séancour, which some have found surprising; Foscolo has not, I think, the 'gravity and severity which distinguish [Séancour] from all the other writers of the sentimental school'.⁵ Arnold probably saw him as one of those 'fathers' who 'water'd with their tears | This sea of time': at one with the Byrons and Shelleys whose 'groans' and 'lovely wails' availed nothing to the later generation.⁶

But a book that is not important or influential may none the less, read at a certain time and place, be an immediate stimulus, the spark to fire a long train of feeling and reflection. This the Letters of Ortis, even if mere chance had brought them in Arnold's way, could have been; at a stage when all forms of literary introspectiveness interested him (and that is an interest very personal to the reader and often difficult in a given case to justify critically). Ortis's exile from Italy, his frustrated hope of happiness in love, his progress towards the final act of disowning the world in suicide, had many claims on Arnold's response. Perhaps enough to justify the affirmative which opens the poem ('Yes, Ortis was isolated—and we all are'). The mountains and woodland scenes, the passages of love might carry a peculiar significance; the more since it was not by mere chance that Arnold read Ortis. The title names the human agent. He would inevitably relate the volume's content to its owner, perhaps to his own action in

¹ *Jacques Ortis* (Paris, 1881), p. 99. My quotation is from the translation by Alexandre Dumas, since this, first published in 1839 and again in 1847, seems likely to be the version that Arnold and Marguerite read. (Cf. Iris E. Sells, *Matthew Arnold and France*, p. 101.) The original Italian work was first published in 1798, but much altered by the author in later editions. He died in 1827.

² *Ibid.*, p. 201.

³ The poem which does sometimes recall Ortis is *Empedocles*; it is the 'finger of reason' which points Ortis 'to the tomb'. The connexion might be worth exploring.

⁴ Arnold's note to 'Obermann once more' in *New Poems*, second edition, 1868.

⁵ 'Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse', 1855; perhaps written 1851, and the verse about Shelley probably as early as 1849.

returning it—across an estranging sea. That 'together they perused' the book in candle-lit evenings in the Hôtel Bellevue at Thun is Mrs. Sells's fancy picture; but one must still admit it very likely that she did really lend him the book (the detail would be a very odd one to invent) and that it meant something to one or both of them. Suppose she, as is common with lenders, thought more highly of it than he, this very realization would add to the poetic stimulus, to the relevance of the volume to the poem.¹

VII

But the sea between criticism and biography is uncomfortable sailing. The important thing now about Marguerite is not who or what she was, but that Arnold put her into his poems. Not only into those which name her in text or title, or are linked by the formal grouping or by common details of person and setting with those which name her; or even only into the whole of the 1852 volume.² She is, has been poetically made, a part of the experience which was among the material of *all* his poems: a part, and not a separable part. Switzerland, Obermann, the poet's conflicting desires for 'solitude' and 'the world without', the felt contrast between cities and mountains, between the hot glare of the day and the coolness of snow and moonlight and clear water, are equally inseparable parts. It is artificial (even for those engaged in biographical detective-work) to argue about which are 'Marguerite' poems. This particular poem, if met only under its 1857 title of 'Isolation', might have been tacitly accepted as 'not a Marguerite poem', and at most would have aroused speculation and debate.

Even with all its titles, it is farther removed from its Marguerite source than its predecessor³ in the series, 'We were apart; and day by day'. The relation between these two poems is puzzling, the more so since it was not made apparent from the beginning. In 1869 Arnold finally tied the poems together by entitling the second one 'To Marguerite, continued' and shifting the title of 'Isolation' to 'We were apart'. There is no parallel to this in Arnold's successive reshufflings of his shorter poems; some poems are split into two, but no other poem first appears alone and then in such close contact with another. Was 'Yes: in the sea' originally written as (or always felt to be) a continuation of 'We were apart'? (The stanza is the same, and is one rarely used by Arnold.) If so, its 'Yes' then comes to affirm a subsidiary statement in the last verse of the preceding poem; 'happier' men are so because they do not know their loneliness; they only 'dream'd two

¹ This is perhaps to indulge fancy as much as Mrs. Sells in another way. But at least one need not, in reaction against the Kingsmill-Trilling view of the relation, assume that because Marguerite read Ortiz the two were necessarily in intellectual sympathy.

² H. W. Garrod [Poetry and the Criticism of Life (London, 1931), p. 39] was the first to emphasize its remarkable unity.

³ In editions from 1857 on.

human hearts might blend', their faith releasing them from 'isolation without end | Prolong'd'. But it is just as likely that that last over-packed verse was deliberately written to make a hinge between the two poems, so that the second might counteract the slightly embittered and arrogant personalities of the first.

If 'Yes: in the sea' is the second part of a two-part poem, it is 'continued' in a different direction. The first poem states an experience of separation, the inconstancy of one heart, and the proud withdrawal of the other in realization of its essential moonlike loneliness, and in remorse for ever having stooped to vain mortal love. The second moves beyond the lovers' case, seeing it only as an extreme and particular instance of the universal human situation. The link is, 'If even lovers cannot really communicate, then men are isolated indeed'. This Arnold has said elsewhere:

Alas, is even Love too weak
To unlock the heart and let it speak?
Are even lovers powerless to reveal
To one another what indeed they feel?
... I knew they [the mass of men] liv'd and mov'd
Trick'd in disguises, alien to the rest
Of men, and alien to themselves—and yet
The same heart beats in every human breast.

('That we have all of us one human heart'; 'parts of a single continent'),

... Ah, well for us, if even we,
Even for a moment, can get free
Our heart, and have our lips unchain'd
For that which seals them hath been deep ordain'd.

('A God, a God their severance rul'd').

The lines¹ are part of 'The Buried Life', where Arnold's theme is primarily man's isolation from his own deeply concealed true self (what he elsewhere calls the 'unlit gulf'²—the 'central stream of what we feel indeed');³ from its 'subterranean depth' come 'airs, and floating echoes' bringing 'a melancholy into all our day'—like the music from the moonlit hollows across the straits, the longing in the island caverns. That poem has of all Arnold's the nearest affinity to 'Yes: in the sea'.⁴ It is also a further reminder that for Arnold, as has been well said, 'l'amour fut une fenêtre ouverte sur le mystère de la vie humaine'.⁵

¹ 1852; ll. 12–23, 26–29.

² 'The Youth of Nature', in *Poems*, 1852.

³ Verse in *St. Paul and Protestantism*.

⁴ On the difficulty of communication see also 'Poor Matthias' (1882), ll. 157–72, especially l. 169, 'Brother man's despairing sign', and ll. 171–2, on the 'Sundering powers'.

⁵ Bonnerot, p. 78.

The subject of 'Yes: in the sea' is human life; and 'the same heart beats in every human breast'. The poem draws part of its strength from the common stock of experience; it represents Arnold's own multifold experience of what was read and thought as well as what was proved upon the pulses. What Arnold affirms in his opening 'Yes' is, finally, something like 'I know now the truth of what so many have written'. Into the poem drift 'airs and floating echoes': 'Isolation is the sum-total of wretchedness to man' . . . 'You and I are but a pair of infinite isolations' . . . 'Each in his hidden sphere of joy or woe' . . . 'A dreary sea now flows between' . . . 'dissociabili—translate as "estranging"'.

Text of 1852

TO MARGUERITE,

IN RETURNING A VOLUME OF THE LETTERS OF ORTIS.

YES: in the sea of life enisl'd,
With echoing straits between us thrown,
Dotting the shoreless watery wild,
We mortal millions live *alone*.

The islands feel the encircling flow,
And then their endless bounds they know.

But when the moon their hollows lights
And they are swept by balms of spring,
And in their glens, on starry nights,
The nightingales divinely sing,
And lovely notes, from shore to shore,
Across the sounds and channels pour;

Oh then a longing like despair
Is to their farthest caverns sent;
—For surely once, they feel, we were
Parts of a single continent.
Now round us spreads the watery plain—
Oh might our marges meet again!

Who order'd, that their longing's fire
Should be, as soon as kindled, cool'd?
Who renders vain their deep desire?
A God, a God their severance rul'd;
And bade betwixt their shores to be
The unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea.

TH
nat
can
sig.
spe
abs
of c
F
bee
spe
qua
con
pro
cha
V
the
ing

1
som
appe
app
Sir
for
1935
for
2
torn
was

5

10

15

20

earns
the
ex-
the
ing
em
ess
his

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

ESSEX'S REBELLION AND DEKKER'S *OLD FORTUNATUS*

THE fact has not been observed that in Thomas Dekker's play *Old Fortunatus* (1600) certain copies deemed to be imperfect have, instead, suffered cancellation by the excision of leaf E2. Of the eleven recorded extant copies, sig. E2 is wanting in the quarto at Eton College and at the Folger Shakespeare Library. In one of the two Harvard copies the fold E2.3 has been abstracted; and in the second, E2.3 is also missing, together with a number of other leaves as well.¹

From over one-third of the preserved copies, therefore, a leaf of text has been torn out. If, as indicated by the Eton and Folger *exempla*, E2 is the specific leaf, the abstraction of the conjugate E3, also, in the two Harvard quartos has no significance, for the fold may have been removed as more convenient, or else the disjunct leaf may have fallen out by accident.² This proportion of mutilated copies is significant and well beyond the range of chance imperfection.

When one examines the text of E2 in the complete copies, one sees that the only passage which could have given cause for cancellation is the following, beginning with line 3 on E2^r:

Fort. In some Courts shall you see ambition
Sit piecing Dedalus old waxen wings,
But being clapt on, and they about to flie,
Euen when their hopes are buried in the clouds,
They melt against the Sunne of maiestie,
And downe they tumble to destruction:
For since the heauens strong armes teach kings to stand,
Angels are plac'd about their glorious throne,
To gard it from the strokes of Traitorous hands.

¹ From this second Harvard copy leaves D1, F1-4, and L2-3 have been subtracted at some early date to complete the present Pforzheimer copy. Since the Pforzheimer quarto appears to have its original E2.3, the absence of the fold in the second Harvard copy apparently results from the cancellation found elsewhere. Owing to faulty reporting to Sir Walter Greg by American libraries, the incomplete gathering E is noted by him only for Eton. See *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, i (London, 1939), entry no. 162. The New York Public Library copy, not listed by Greg, is complete for gathering E.

² There is nothing in the text on sig. E3 to excite suspicion. Just possibly, E2 was torn from bound and the fold E2.3 removed from unbound copies when cancellation was decided upon.

The text as we have it is apparently that acted at court; and thus these lines could have given no offence when first written, produced, and printed. One cannot say with certainty, indeed, that Dekker had any specific application in mind except for a vague reference, perhaps, to such traitors as Lopez and Parry whom he excoriates in *The Whore of Babylon*. Moreover, the fact that no cancellans was printed argues for the excision of the leaf at some time after the conclusion of printing and at a point, as indicated by the relatively large proportion of unmutilated copies, when sale was well advanced. Apparently the stationer, at that time, felt no urgent need to perfect the remaining copies by printing a substitute leaf. It seems proper, therefore, to look for some post-publication event which would cause the stationer, doubtless on advice, to rip the leaf—suddenly given a specific and dangerous application—from his unsold copies to avoid trouble with the authorities.

The rebellion of the Earl of Essex seems to fit this set of circumstances better than any other event. His futile outbreak of 8 February 1601 was succeeded by his trial and execution. An event so painful to Elizabeth was not one for literary men to meddle with, and someone connected with the book seems to have taken alarm rather less than a year after initial publication. The case is, of course, conjectural. But the peculiar facts of cancellation, and the proportion of uncancelled copies, fit the date of early 1601 well enough. Certainly no other event between 1600 and 1603 parallels Dekker's lines so closely as the fall of Essex.

FREDSON BOWERS

MILTON'S KNOWLEDGE OF AESCHYLUS: THE ARGUMENT FROM PARALLEL PASSAGES

AESCHYLUS was not a popular writer, even among scholars, in the seventeenth century,¹ and Milton was exceptional in ranking him with Sophocles and Euripides, as he did in the preface to *Samson Agonistes*.² Apart from that passage, there is only one other reference to Aeschylus by name in his writings, and that is a refutation, in the *First Defence*,³ of Salmasius's unscrupulous use of a speech from the *Suppliants* taken out of its dramatic

¹ The evidence for England has not, as far as I know, been examined in detail. For France, see Georges Méautis, 'Eschyle dans la littérature française', *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* (July–Sept. 1917), and more briefly in the same author's *Eschyle et la Trilogie* (Paris, 1936), pp. 42–3.

² W. R. Parker, *Milton's Debt to Greek Tragedy in Samson Agonistes* (Baltimore, 1937), p. 247, notes that only Sophocles and Euripides are mentioned in *Reason of Church Government and Of Education*.

³ Columbia edition, vii. 306 ff

context. But it has often been felt that the two poets have qualities in common, and it is therefore with interest that one turns to the passages cited in the index to the Columbia edition as probable borrowings by Milton from specific passages in Aeschylus. The assessment of borrowings is always a tricky business. The editor of the index writes (pp. xi-xii): 'I have used my own best judgment in deciding whether the passage involved is a direct borrowing, an unconscious reminiscence, or an accidental resemblance in thought or style. Allusions that seemed too far-fetched have been deliberately omitted.' Though it is not stated, it would seem natural to suppose that only resemblances judged to be accidental have been omitted. (Or are even they included, so long as they are not 'farfetched'? If so, much of my criticism falls to the ground, but the charge that the entries are calculated to mislead would be reinforced.) No differentiation is recorded between the editor's first two classes.

It would not be surprising to find a few passages where the editor's judgement seemed questionable. But the result of an examination of the thirty-four¹ passages in Aeschylus which are claimed to have been echoed by Milton is startling. There is not a single one where it can be said with confidence that Milton must have had, or even that he very probably had, Aeschylus in mind whether consciously or unconsciously. It will be instructive to look at some of the parallels as a warning.² But first one must in fairness say this: there is usually some resemblance between the two passages compared. The editor (engaged on a Herculean task, by which he has put us all in his debt) may well have felt that it was best to play safe—previous editors of Milton had regarded it as probable or possible that he was recalling Aeschylus in this passage or that, and it was not certain that they were wrong. And so the examples piled up. It is only when one looks at them all together that the weakness of the case becomes apparent.

The play that provides by far the greatest number of alleged borrowings (twenty-four out of thirty-four) is the *Prometheus Bound*. It may readily be admitted that there is a reasonable *a priori* probability here, so far as general influence goes. The structure of the play, with its static hero receiving various visitors in turn, almost certainly influenced that of *Samson*

¹ Inconsistent references have led to some duplication, but there are thirty-one distinct passages in Aeschylus cited.

² *De me fabula*. I thought I had discovered a fairly certain echo in the following passage: 'this day will pour down, | If I conjecture aught, no drizzling showr, | But ratling storm of Arrows barbd with fire' (P.L. vi. 544-6). The 'showr . . . storm' contrast recalled *Ag.* 1533-4: δέδοικα δ' ὄμβρον κτύπον δομοσφαλῆ | τὸν αἰματηρὸν· ψακάς δὲ λήγει [I fear the crashing torrent of blood will wreck the house; it is no longer early drizzle': tr. Walter Headlam in *The Plays of Aeschylus*, translated by Walter Headlam and C. E. S. Headlam (London, 1909); I use this translation throughout to avoid any suspicion of manipulating the evidence]. I still think this better than most of the Columbia citations, but it seems much less certain than it did when I assumed that they were in the main sound.

Agonistes,¹ and in character and situation Prometheus has certain affinities with Satan. This being so, it is surprising how few close verbal parallels there are between the *Prometheus* and either *Samson* or *Paradise Lost*.

Five parallels are claimed between Book I of *Paradise Lost* and *Prometheus*. Two of these are very general and arise from the similarity of situation. All that they have in common is the defiant attitude of the protagonist (*P.L.* i. 94 and *P.V.* 992 ff.; *P.L.* i. 111 and *P.V.* 1002 ff. The line-number of all Aeschylus references is normalized in accordance with modern editions). Rather more convincing is the citation for i. 263: 'Better to reign in Hell, than serve in Heav'n' of *P.V.* 966-7: *τῆς σῆς λατρείας τὴν ἐμὴν δυσπραξίαν, | σαφῶς ἐπίστασ', οὐκ ἀν ἀλλάξαιμ' ἔγώ.² But there is no close verbal similarity, and Todd himself cites a passage from Phineas Fletcher which makes it unnecessary to look to Aeschylus: 'To be in heaven the second he disdains: So now the first in hell and flames he reignes.'³ The other two parallels claimed are more purely verbal. One is extremely trivial: 'The gloomy Deep' in i. 152 is compared to *P.V.* 219-20: *Ταράπον μελαμβαθής | κενθμών*.⁴ The other is on the face of it more promising: to the reader of Aeschylus, Milton's 'Adamantine Chains' (i. 48) certainly do recall *P.V.* 6: *ἀδαμαντίνων δεσμῶν ἐν ἀρρήκτοις πέδαις*.⁵ But here again the early editors give the answer to themselves. 'Adamantine Chains' is quoted by them from Spenser, Drayton, Drummond, and Phineas Fletcher. There is, then, nothing in Book I of *Paradise Lost* which, by the normal canons of literary evidence, would be accepted as even making it probable that Milton had ever read *Prometheus*, and this is a very fair specimen of the whole body of evidence.*

The parallel in situation between Prometheus and Samson is equally unfruitful in verbal correspondence. The argument from structure is here, I think, strong, but only three passages⁶ are cited and they are not convincing. The commonplace that 'apt words have power to swage The humors of a troubl'd mind' (ll. 184-5) no doubt could come from *ὅργης νοούσης εἰσὶν λατροὶ λόγοι* (*P.V.* 378).⁷ Both are addressed to the prota-

¹ On this subject W. R. Parker, *op. cit.*, is exhaustive; see especially ch. ii, paragraph 18. Parker adds some fairly good verbal parallels, but nothing to upset the general conclusions of this paper, which in any case is concerned primarily with the evidence as presented in the Columbia index. Parker's book no doubt appeared too late for the editor of the index to use.

² 'Be very sure, I would not exchange my misfortunes for thy servitude.'

³ *Locusts* (1627), p. 37. Even closer, as Professor G. B. A. Fletcher points out to me, is the same author's *Purple Island*, vii. 10: 'In Heaven they scorn'd to serve, so now in Hell they reign.' The index gives this reference.

⁴ 'The black nether deep of Tartarus.'

⁵ 'In firm shackles of adamantine bonds.'

⁶ Parker, *op. cit.*, adds some more.

⁷ 'Words are the physicians of a mood distempered.' With this Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 180, n. 5 compares also *S.A.* 605: 'healing words'.

gonist by a sympathetic chorus, but equally good parallels (if any are required) have been cited from other authors, classical and English. *S.A.* 623 ff. has very little resemblance to *P.V.* 878 ff. In *S.A.* 133 ff. Todd compares the Officer's advice to that of Hermes, *P.V.* 1033 ff., and Samson's reply to that of Prometheus (1040 ff.), but there is no verbal similarity.

It would be tedious to go through all the other instances in detail. A few specimens will suffice. Trifling verbal resemblances are represented by the following examples. In *P.L.* ii. 283, Mammon ends his speech: 'Ye have what I advise.' We are referred to *Ag.* 582: *πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον*¹ and to *Eum.* 710: *εἰρηται λόγος*.² On *P.R.* i. 296: 'A pathless Desert' is quoted *P.V.* 2: *ἄβατον εἰς ἐρημίαν*—literal but entirely commonplace. In these the parallel is at least genuine, but in one case it rests on a sheer howler. For Milton's 'eye Of fond desire' (*P.R.* ii. 210-11) Dunster cites 'the immediate expression, the eye of desire' from *P.V.* 654: *ώς ἀν τὸ Δίον ὅμμα λωφήσῃ πόθον*,³ where *πόθον* is dependent not on *ὅμμα* but on *λωφήσῃ*. Thyer's quotation on this passage, *Suppl.* 1003-5: *καὶ παρθένων χλαδαῖσιν εὐμόρφοις ἐπὶ | πᾶς τις παρελθὼν ὅμματος θελκτήριον | τόξευμ' ἐπεμψεν, ἵμέρων νικάμενος*,⁴ if not very close is by comparison sensible. A possible but not coercive example of this class is *P.L.* ix. 178: 'spite then with spite is best repaid', compared with *P.V.* 970: *οὐτως ἵβριζειν τοὺς ὑβρίζοντας χρεών*.⁵ There is one place where the Columbia index has cited an extremely vague parallel, while omitting a much better one referred to in the same note. Todd on *P.L.* vii. 431-2: 'the Aire|Floats, as they pass, fann'd with unnumber'd plumes' cites *P.V.* 125-6: *αἰθήρ δ' ἐλαφρᾶς πτερύγων ρίπαις ὑποσυρίζει*.⁶ It is hard to see what Milton is supposed to have taken from Aeschylus here beyond the abstruse knowledge that birds use their wings in flying, but Todd gives a cross-reference to a genuine verbal similarity, *P.L.* i. 767-8: 'Brusht with the hiss of russling wings.'

The occurrence of proper names has provoked some citations that are horrid warnings. Because the word occurs in *Ag.* 1189, it is cited (on *Comus* 58) as a source for the name, though, as Todd points out, 'Mr. Hole

¹ 'You have my tale in full.'

² 'My words are ended.' Professor G. B. A. Fletcher points out to me that the same expression occurs in Euripides, *Orestes* 1203 (which the index also cites), and that there is a list of similar concluding expressions in tragedy in Blaydes's note on *Ag.* 582.

³ 'To the end that the eye of Zeus may be eased of his desire.'

⁴ 'And so every man in passing darts under the influence of desire a seductive arrow of the eye at the dainty loveliness of virgins.' The differences between the two passages are, however, more important than the similarities. In *Suppl.* 'the eyes are on the offensive', in *P.R.* the eye has been overcome. Professor G. B. A. Fletcher, from whom I take this observation, suggests as a parallel to Milton's lines Euripides, *Hippolytus*, 525-6: *Ἐπως, Ἐπως, δ καὶ ὅμμάτων στάζεις πόθον*.

⁵ 'That is how one ought to insult the insolent.' (Headlam prefers another rendering, but this is how Milton is supposed to have taken the line.)

⁶ 'The sky is whistling with the light rapid beat of pinions.'

observes that Mr. Warton's quotation from the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus does not agree with the character of Milton's *Comus*.¹ The other citation of this kind is even more arbitrary. The account in *P.L.* ii. 943-7 of the Arimaspians pursued by the 'Gryfon' was traced by the early editors to Herodotus and Pliny. But Todd adds: 'A learned friend has observed to me, that this simile is conceived from the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, ver. 803 et seq.' In fact, though the griffins and the Arimaspians are mentioned there in succession, there is no reference to the story which Milton uses. The only item under this head which is not patently erroneous is the reference, for the account of Xerxes in *P.L.* x. 307 ff., to *Pers.* 65 ff. But there is no close verbal similarity, and the tradition of the scourging of the waves by Xerxes is not in Aeschylus. (Dunster's reference to *Pers.* 396-7, a perfectly normal reference to rowing as smiting the sea, is patently inept.) Slightly more suggestive but still commonplace is the resemblance between *P.R.* iii. 333-4: 'or over-lay [With bridges rivers proud, as with a yoke]', and *Pers.* 71-2: ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλῶν αὐχένι πόντου,¹ and that between *P.L.* x. 307: 'the libertie of *Greece* to yoke', and *Pers.* 50: ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλεῖν δούλιον Ἑλλάδι.² (The latter is not in the Columbia index.)

To the examples cited earlier which rely primarily on resemblance of situation may be added *Comus* 855-6: 'for maid'nhood she loves, and will be swift | To aid a Virgin, such as was her self.' Here Thyer's citation of *Suppl.* 149-50: ἀδμήτας ἀδμήτα | ρύσιος γενέσθω³ is at least sensible, but scarcely demonstrates indebtedness.⁴

I have already quoted all the other examples which seem to me to have the slightest plausibility, with three exceptions, which I now cite for the sake of completeness: *P.L.* ii. 163 ff., with which compare for the situation Oceanus' speech in *P.V.* 307-29; *P.L.* iv. 858-9: 'But like a proud Steed reind, went hautie on, | Chaumping his iron curb', with which compare *P.V.* 1009-10: δακῶν δὲ στόμον ὡς νεοζυγῆς | πᾶλος βιάζη καὶ πρὸς ἥνιας μάχη⁵ (but the comparison is a very usual one); *P.L.* x. 701 ff.: 'With adverse blast up-turns them from the South | *Notus* and *Afer* black with

¹ 'Casting . . . as a yoke upon the neck of Ocean.' Milton is probably doing no more than make explicit the literal sense of Latin *iungere* as used in such a phrase as *amnem ponte iungere* (Lewin and Short, 'jungo' I. A. 1).

² 'Casting the yoke of servitude about Hellas.'

³ 'Come . . . maiden to a maiden's rescue.'

⁴ The following, by way of contrast, is an example (not in the Columbia index) of a borrowing that I consider certain: similarity of situation and verbal similarity supplement each other, and I think it is a thoroughly deliberate allusion. Dalila's lines, *S.A.* 907-8, 'I was a fool, too rash, and quite mistaken | In what I thought would have succeeded best' echo Deianeira's, Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 666-7: ἀθυμῶς δὲ φανήσομαι τάχα | κακὸν μέγι *ἐκπράξαο* ἀν' ἀπόδος καλῆς ('I feel a misgiving that I shall presently be found to have wrought a great mischief, the issue of a fair hope': tr. Jebb).

⁵ 'Thou dost take the bit in thy teeth, like a colt new to harness, and plunge violently and fight against the reins.'

thundrous Clouds | From *Serraliona*; thwart of these as fierce | Forth rush the *Levant* and the *Ponent* Windes | *Eurus* and *Zephir* with their lateral noise, | *Sirocco*, and *Libeccio*', with which compare *P.V.* 1085-7; σκυρτᾶ δ' ἀνέμων | πνεύματα πάντων εἰς ἀλληλα | στάσις ἀντίποντος ἀποδεικνύμενα¹ (but there is really nothing the passages have in common beyond a description of opposing winds—it would, in fact, be more plausible as far as internal evidence goes to maintain that Shakespeare's 'to-and-fro-conflicting wind and rain' was taken from Aeschylus; his lines are more Aeschylean than Milton's).

This survey furnishes, among other things, an interesting sample of the powers of judgement of the early commentators. Thyer comes off by far the best—his comparisons are never silly. Dunster is the worst. The others come in between.

A number of morals can be drawn from this survey. It brings home the danger of the game of parallels, unless it is played with great caution. The evidence from general probability, and from the two references to Aeschylus by name, is sufficient to satisfy one that Milton knew Aeschylus, though it may be doubted whether he was very intimately familiar with him. But it is a sobering thought that from the evidence of his verse alone it would be impossible to infer that he had ever read a line of him, except (and it is no doubt an important exception) for the broad structural outlines of *Samson*. It is also clear that if the Aeschylus entry is a fair sample, it would be most unwise to use the Columbia index as a guide to Milton's reading. If the editor had clearly described his index entries as Variorum lists of all the passages in which Milton had been thought by persons not demonstrably insane to be indebted to a given author, readers would not be misled.²

J. C. MAXWELL

NOTES ON THE INFLUENCE OF MORGANN'S ESSAY ON FALSTAFF

IN a note on 'The Influence of Maurice Morgann' P. L. Carver pointed out a line in which Hazlitt is probably quoting a few words, freely, after his fashion, from Morgann's *Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff* (1777).³ The quotation is in Hazlitt's review of Spence's *Anec-*

¹ 'The blasts of all the winds leap wildly and display contention setting contrary against each other.'

² No doubt errors of omission will gradually be detected. Here is one in the Horace entry. On the famous 'better teacher than Scotus or Aquinas' in *Areopagitica* (Columbia, iv. 311), Hales rightly quotes Horace, *Epist.* i. ii. 3-4: 'qui quid sit pulchrum, quid turpe, quid utile, quid non, | plenius ac melius Chrysippo et Crantore dicit.' The contrast of a poet teaching by example with two abstract philosophers is surely a deliberate allusion. Milton, as the index notes, quotes the Latin of this passage in *Of Civil Power* (Columbia, vi. 11).

³ *R.E.S.*, vi (1930), 320-2.

dates in the *Edinburgh Review* of May 1820. A second edition of Morgann's essay was published in 1820, as Carver knew, though at the time and place of writing he could not tell whether it appeared before or after May. The answer is provided by a highly favourable review of Morgann's republished essay in the *London Magazine* of February.¹ The probability of Hazlitt's having seen this review is strong. First, he was a regular contributor to the *London Magazine*, a new periodical, and one of a series of theatrical criticisms he wrote for it appears in the same issue.² Secondly, the review of Morgann is separated by only a few pages from a review of Hazlitt's own *Lectures on the Age of Elizabeth*; and, curiously enough, those pages are filled by a review of Spence's *Anecdotes*, another possible link in the chain of association.³ It is likely, then, that Hazlitt knew of the existence of Morgann's essay and had a good idea of its contents, though we still do not know whether he read it; the quotation he uses appears in an excerpt reprinted in the *London Magazine*.⁴ He quotes Morgann nowhere else, and, if anything, the evidence seems to show that his acquaintance was limited to this 1820 review. In 1819 Hazlitt had spoken of Falstaff as a wit who makes a butt of himself, a point Morgann had made in his essay; Carver conjectures that, therefore, Hazlitt may have been inspired by the first edition of the essay, may have known it all his life, and may have discussed it with Coleridge, and that Morgann, then, would be not an isolated figure but the prophet and founder of the Hazlitt-Coleridge-De Quincey school of criticism. But so large a conjecture is hardly justified by so small a coincidence.

Morgann's essay, on its first appearance, did attract a few devoted admirers. The publisher himself refused to take it seriously,⁵ and the

¹ i. 194-8. Another favourable review had been published in January in the *New Monthly Magazine* (xiii. 90).

The anonymous Preface of the 1820 edition is dated November 1819, and the essay seems to have been published in late November or December. It is listed among 'Works in the Press' in the October *British Critic* (n.s. xii. 448), and the *Repository of Arts, Literature, Fashions, Manufactures, &c.* of 1 November (Ser. 2, viii. 308) reported that the admirers of Shakespeare would be glad to learn that 'the very scarce and admirable' essay was now being reprinted. It appears in the new publication notices of a number of periodicals in November, December, and January.

² pp. 162-8. This was the second issue of the *London Magazine*.

³ The review of Hazlitt is on pp. 185-91, Spence, pp. 191-4.

⁴ p. 196.

⁵ '... I should as soon believe Roderigo to be a man of sense, and Iago a man of virtue, as suspect Falstaff to have any spark of bravery in him.' Thomas Davies, *A Genuine Narrative of the Life and Theatrical Transactions of Mr. John Henderson, Commonly Called the Bath Roscius* (London, 1777), p. 51 n. (It would be interesting to know whether Davies had been present when Dr. Johnson delivered his opinion of Morgann's essay.) Cf. also Davies's *Dramatic Miscellanies* (London, 1783-4), i. 272-3. His other comments on Falstaff, however, indicate that he had read Morgann more seriously than he would admit (*Life of Henderson*, pp. 51-2); cf. also Henry Mackenzie, *Lounger*, No. 69 (27 May 1786).

Monthly Review dismissed it briefly,¹ but others were much taken, as the opposition admitted. Eleven years later (1788) the Rev. Richard Stack thought it necessary to publish his rebuttal;² the *Analytical Review*, approving of Stack's argument, found it 'difficult . . . to account for the notice into which this [Morgann's] essay has risen'.³ The first to take complimentary notice of Morgann were the *Critical Review* and William Kenrick in his *London Review of English and Foreign Literature*, both in May 1777. Kenrick described the essay as a 'most excellent piece of Dramatic Criticism', and almost all of his lazy eight-page account consisted of excerpts.⁴ To the *Critical Review* the author was a man of 'genius and sagacity', and it recommended his essay 'with an unusual degree of zeal and approbation . . .'. 'We do not assert that our Essayist has so far succeeded, as to secure his decision from all future controversy', but he has done more than could be expected in stemming the tide of 'ancient prejudice'.⁵ An even warmer advocate was a critic of the *European Magazine* of 1788; William Richardson had just written his analysis of Falstaff's character, judging him by a stricter moral standard and with less affectionate indulgence than Morgann, and this critic was greatly incensed. After a few short illustrative sentences from Richardson he turned to a better source: 'Let us now contrast this with a sketch by another hand, who is indeed calculated to do justice to "poor old Jack"', and three pages of Morgann's essay followed. 'Such is the Falstaff of Mr. Morgan [sic], of Shakespeare, of Nature'.⁶ In 1797 Morgann's treatment of Shakespeare was said to be 'the portrait of Homer painted by Apelles',⁷ and in 1806 it was 'unequalled, unless it be by the celebrated delineation of the same great dramatist by the hand of Dryden'.⁸ The most interesting disciple

¹ lvii (1777), 79–80; written by Colman the Elder. Cf. also lxxxi (1789), 54 n.; by Christopher Moody.

² 'An Examination of an Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff', *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, ii (1788), 'Polite Literature', pp. 3–37.

³ vii (1790), 406.

⁴ v. 366–73. Long excerpts from Morgann were published also by the *Universal Magazine*, lxi (1777), 5–6, and the *London Magazine*, xlvi (1777), 313–14; I am indebted for these two references to R. W. Babcock, *The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry* (Chapel Hill, 1931), p. 208 n.

⁵ xliii. 397. The review was reprinted in part in the *Scots Magazine*, xxxix (1777), 261.

⁶ xiv. 423–4 (reprinted, without acknowledgement, in the *Hibernian Magazine*, January 1789, pp. 24–6). Another critic, however, saw no conflict between Richardson and the 'ingenious and acute' Mr. Morgann; *English Review*, xiv (1789), 97–98.

⁷ William Seward, *Supplement to the Anecdotes of Some Distinguished Persons* (London, 1797), p. 151 n. This was quoted by William Cooke in the Preface to his poem *Conversation* (London, 1807).

⁸ Charles Symmons, *The Prose Works of John Milton; with a Life of the Author* (London, 1806), vii. 81–4 n. In 1801 Thomas James Mathias recommended a reprinting of Morgann's essay; *The Pursuits of Literature* (11th ed., London), pp. 353–4 n. (Cf. the original note on Morgann, in which this recommendation was not included, in 'Part the Fourth' of

was the poet laureate Pye, who refers to Morgann a number of times in his *Commentary Illustrating the Poetic of Aristotle* (1792), and gives this testimony of faith:

though I first took the book up on the recommendation of a friend, it was with the strongest prejudice against what I thought an indefensible paradox; yet every word led to conviction; and I laid it down with the firmest assurance, that the author was perfectly in the right. I have since recommended the perusal of it to several of my friends, who have all opened it with the same prejudice, and shut it with the same conviction.¹

This is enough to show that Morgann did have at least a thin line of enthusiastic readers.² Carver is correct in saying that he was not an isolated figure. But as he was not an isolated figure neither was he the prophet and founder of a new school of criticism. Morgann, however brilliant, was one of a long series of writers creating a new concept of Falstaff and a new type of Shakespearian criticism; he had important predecessors and successors, and does not seem to have impressed many people as particularly significant. According to the anonymous Preface of the 1820 edition he was an author of 'unmerited obscurity'; his essay had 'slumbered upon the shelf' so long, said the *New Monthly Magazine* of the same year, that it had 'probably contracted dust of some two or three inches in thickness'.³ R. W. Babcock has said that Hazlitt, 'in direct opposition to the Morgann tradition', calls Falstaff a coward.⁴ But what Hazlitt actually says is, 'He is represented as a liar, a braggart, a coward, a glutton, etc. and yet we are not offended but delighted with him; for he is all these as much to amuse others as to gratify himself. He openly assumes all these characters to shew the humourous part of them'.⁵ In other words, Hazlitt has outbid Morgann for Falstaff's soul by at least three vices; Sir John is not only not a coward, but no liar, braggart, nor glutton; and the 'etc.' may be fairly interpreted as full absolution for whatever uncatalogued sins may remain. But obviously this cannot be taken as evidence that Hazlitt had read Morgann. Falstaff's character underwent a mellowing process during the eighteenth century and Morgann neither began nor completed it.

Mathias's poem; London, 1797, p. 41.) Symmons, a friend of Morgann's, explains that the essay had not been reprinted only because of Morgann's modesty; he had been 'importuned in vain'. Symmons and William Cooke were cited at length in the Preface to the 1820 edition.

¹ p. 308; cf. also pp. xii, 101 n., 123, 175 and n., 274 n., 307-9, 325 n., 486 n.

² Babcock (pp. 229-30) has pointed out two other complimentary references to Morgann in the *Monthly Magazine* of 1811 (xxxii. 211 and 325-6). One of these calls the essay 'celebrated', which Babcock takes as an indication that Morgann 'was apparently well known in the period . . .'. It seems more probable that the word was used chiefly as a flourish to introduce an authority. ³ xiii. 90. ⁴ p. 233.

⁵ *Characters of Shakespear's Plays; Works*, ed. P. P. Howe (London and Toronto, 1930-4), iv. 279.

Similarly, Morgann was perhaps the only eighteenth-century critic to write a 'philosophic' defence of the pathos of Shakespeare's puns,¹ but unusual as this is it is not legitimate evidence, however tempting, that Coleridge had read Morgann. It is a defence of Shakespeare inevitable in the type of criticism written by Morgann and other late-eighteenth-century critics and Coleridge. When the Shakespearian criticism of the late eighteenth century reached its culmination in Coleridge and Hazlitt, Morgann's achievement, as one of the cleverest of their forerunners, could be appreciated, and his essay was reprinted in 1820.² The *London Magazine* thought highly of it; Hazlitt read the review and a phrase stuck in his mind for a month or two; Henry Crabb Robinson read the essay in 1824 and made a note of that fact but of nothing more:³ he had heard and read the same things said by better critics in better form.

STUART MALCOLM TAVE

¹ 1777 ed., pp. 105-6 n.

² Another 'edition', with a different publisher, appeared in 1825. It is not, however, proof of the essay's popularity, but quite the opposite; the unsold sheets of the 1820 edition were bound up with a new title-page.

³ *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and Their Writers*, ed. Edith J. Morley (London, 1938), i. 316.

CORRESPONDENCE

MARVELL AND SIDNEY

THE EDITOR, *The Review of English Studies*

Dear Sir,

I have just observed Professor L. C. Martin's note (*R.E.S.*, ii. 374-5) on Marvell's possible debt, in *The Definition of Love*, to Sidney's *Arcadia*. Perhaps I might remark that the debt was suggested, and that the chief parallel phrases were quoted, in my *O.H.E.L.* volume, pp. 162-3.

DOUGLAS BUSH

REVIEWS

The Audience of Beowulf. By DOROTHY WHITELOCK. Pp. vi+111. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. 10s. 6d. net.

'It would be unsafe to argue that any part of England was in the eighth century insufficiently advanced in intellectual attainments for a sophisticated poem like *Beowulf* to have been composed there and appreciated.' These closing words sum up that part of Miss Whitelock's argument which is no doubt the most controversial, as it is probably the most salutary. She begins by pointing out the danger that familiar theories put forward by scholars of authority may come to be accepted almost as dogma, and so may impede free inquiry. Not long ago she outlined some of the objections to widely held views of the date of *Beowulf* and other Old English poems;¹ and in the three lectures that make up the present book she amplifies that warning with apt illustrations drawn from her exceptionally wide and accurate knowledge of Anglo-Saxon history. The view now generally favoured—that *Beowulf* was composed in 'the age of Bede', and probably in Northumbria—she shows to present real difficulty because it allows too little time for the long tradition of Christian verse which the poem implies. She suggests that modern critics may have been led to this opinion partly at least because they know more about Northumbria in the age of Bede than about any other part of England until much later; and she brings forward telling evidence not only for the persistence in Northumbria later in the eighth century of conditions favourable to artistic achievement, but also for the cultivation of learning and religion elsewhere. That *Beowulf* could have been composed even after the eighth century she thinks 'highly unlikely', owing to the obvious incompatibility of its respect for the Danes with the Viking attacks on England. This is a reasonable view, widely shared; and yet is not too much made of it? For it is surely surprising enough, to modern feeling, that someone should have thought fit to have *Beowulf* copied into our existing manuscript near a time when *ne dohte hit nu lange inne ne ute, ac wæs here and hete on gewelhwilcum ende oft and gelome, and Engle nu lange eal sigelease.* . . . She regards the hypothesis that the poem may have originated at the court of Offa of Mercia as 'possible and attractive, but incapable of proof'; on the other hand, she is not convinced that Anglian forms in the manuscript require us to believe in an Anglian original. Her object, in this part of the book, is not to offer a new hypothesis but to disturb incipient dogmatism resting on inadequate grounds. In this she admirably succeeds.

But the first aim of the book is to elucidate the poem by considering what its hearers knew and thought of the themes and problems of society, history, and belief which it embodies. Among much that is valuable two especially illuminating discussions may be noticed. The duty of vengeance is proved, by examples from history and law, to have survived the conversion as an active force, so that throughout the Anglo-Saxon period the tragic choice of Hengest would strike

¹ 'Anglo-Saxon Poetry and the Historian', *Trans. R. Hist. Soc.*, 4th ser., xxxi (1949).

contemporary listeners as a dilemma that might come upon themselves. On this theme Miss Whitelock makes the suggestive comment (p. 96) that the poet, for all his interest in human conflicts, did not always choose to make the most of such a situation: Beowulf himself after the death of Heardred faced a problem like Hengest's, but the poet only glances at it. The implications of the Frankish *Liber Monstrorum* she considers in the light of M. Thomas's demonstration that the book was written in England: it affords independent evidence that the name and nationality of Hygelac were known in this country. She adds the intriguing speculation that, as the *Liber Monstrorum* uses both *Alexander's Letter* and the *Marvels of the East*, it may have more than a coincidental connexion with MS. Cotton Vitellius A. xv. However this may be, the compiler of the manuscript seems to have shared Miss Whitelock's opinion that *Beowulf* 'is surely first and foremost literature of entertainment'; and the corollary that it was 'intended mainly for laymen' seems inevitable.

Linguistic matters other than vocabulary Miss Whitelock discusses with notable, perhaps regrettable, brevity. She is sceptical—I think rightly—of the usefulness of 'occasional spellings' in dating such changes as contraction after loss of intervocalic *h*; but she has found a new *h* form, for those who like them, in a list of witnesses of the early eighth century. She offers no opinion on scribal aberrations which might possibly indicate an early written copy, such as the notorious *wundini* in l. 1382—lately accepted again by Dr. von Schaubert. Miss Whitelock would perhaps agree rather with Mr. Sisam's judgement in a recent article in this journal that 'it is most unlikely that this extraordinary ending would survive for three centuries'.¹ She is surely right in agreeing with another important note of his in the same article,² supporting the interpretation of *modþryðo* in l. 1931 as an abstract noun.

This is a book full of good sense, reasonable in both doubt and speculation. No one interested in *Beowulf* can afford to neglect it.

NORMAN DAVIS

Chaucer and the Canterbury Tales. By WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE.

Pp. xii+184. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1950. 12s. 6d. net.

Chaucer the Maker. By JOHN SPEIRS. Pp. 222. London: Faber & Faber, 1951.

15s. net.

The stated aim of Dr. Lawrence's book is to make available, for those who are interested in the *Canterbury Tales* as literature, some of the results of the large body of research produced during the last fifty years. The author expressly limits himself to the consideration of the structure and design of the *Canterbury Tales*, but the book is, in fact, rather more limited in scope than his statement suggests. It consists (after an introductory chapter) of five essays on selected problems connected with the plan of the *Tales*. The problems vary in kind, ranging from the technical one of the order of the *Tales* to the critical one considered under the title of 'Realism and Artifice'.

¹ R.E.S., xxii (1946), 263, n. 1.

² Ibid., p. 266, n. 1.

The virtues of the book proceed from two qualities well known to Dr. Lawrence's readers, his common sense and his power of reducing a complicated problem to its simplest terms. The first enables him to make short work of the scholars who, misled by that illusion of reality which is the result of art, have discussed such questions as the number of days Chaucer's pilgrims were on the road, or have laboured to identify the pilgrims with living contemporaries of the poet. His remark 'these *seem* to be portraits; but actually are not' has long needed saying.

Dr. Lawrence's gift for clear, succinct exposition appears in his chapter on the sequence of the *Tales*. This is the part of the book by which 'the beginner in Chaucer' is likely to profit most. 'Specialists' will, of course, be conscious of all that has had to be suppressed, and they may feel that justice is hardly done to recent work on the manuscripts. The real defect of this discussion, however, and of the succeeding one on the Marriage Group, is the unprovable assumption that, if we establish the order in which Chaucer intended the *Tales* to be read, we have at the same time established the order in which they were written. The assumption is never explicitly stated, but it seems to lie at the back of a number of remarks about the composition of the *Tales*; for instance, the suggestion that, having 'furbished up an old piece' as the Knight's Tale, Chaucer at once wrote the tales of the Miller and the Reeve. (Cf. p. 86. See, too, remarks on the connexion between the Nun's Priest's Tale and the Wife's Prologue, and between 'Melibœus' and the Nun's Priest's Tale, pp. 125, 134.)

Over-simplification is frequent elsewhere in the book, and leads to some one-sided and questionable judgements. It ought to be possible to agree that Pertelote, and, through her, women and 'wommenes conseils', are ridiculed in the Nun's Priest's Tale and, at the same time, to recognize the many other strands in the complex weave of this Tale. Dr. Lawrence, however, sees the Tale merely as a 'bolt' shot by the Nun's Priest at the sovereignty of women (pp. 134-6). Several statements about the Middle Ages cry out for evidence to support them, or at least for discussion; for instance, that, in that period, 'the charm of contrast was little recognized' (p. 38), or that medieval story-tellers were 'less interested in *description* [italics supplied] and characterization than in action and sentiment' (p. 29).

In conclusion, may a native of England be allowed a protest against the American habit of using the word 'British', when 'English' is meant? Chaucer, Langland, and their contemporaries would certainly not have recognized themselves as 'British' authors (cf. p. 24).

Mr. John Speirs's book is announced as a 'revaluation of the work of Chaucer', 'a fresh estimate' arrived at 'by the methods of literary criticism', and the author writes like one who has a message to deliver. If he had, his repetitive insistence might be excused, and the vagueness of some of his expressions, perhaps even his carelessness. (Examples of this are the surprising assumption that we know with some certainty the chronology of Chaucer's works, p. 35; the inaccuracy of the statement about the order of the *Tales*, p. 136; the inappropriate use of the terms octosyllabic and decasyllabic in reference to Chaucer's lines, p. 90; the mis-spellings of well-known names—'Wharton' for 'Warton' on the title-page,

'Livingstone Lowes' for 'Livingston Lowes', pp. 83, 86.) But little that Mr. Speirs has to say about Chaucer is, in fact, new, and much is very familiar indeed. Matthew Arnold's 'charge that Chaucer's poetry lacks "high seriousness"', Dryden's phrase 'God's plenty', the comparison of the eagle in the *House of Fame* to a lecturing professor, the recognition of the dramatic quality of Chaucer's writing in *Troilus* and the *Canterbury Tales*—all these are almost traditional (though not the less worth considering on that account).

Of course Mr. Speirs has some opinions of his own on Chaucer's poems, and perhaps more on Chaucer's critics. He finds, for instance, 'a *fabliau* element' in the character of Criseyde (pp. 52 ff.), and he thinks that critics have failed to recognize the true significance of the Nun's Priest's Tale, which he sees as a 'tragi-comic allegory of the Fall of Man' (p. 193). With such opinions the reader is free to agree or not, as he chooses. In the present writer's opinion (for what it is worth), his remarks on the biblical echoes and allusions in the Clerk's Tale (pp. 153-4) are more valuable.

To judge from the Introduction and Conclusion, however, Mr. Speirs regards certain broad generalizations as the most important parts of his message. These are that Chaucer is a great English poet, perhaps the greatest after Shakespeare; that he belongs to the main tradition of English literature and it is worth while to consider him beside 'modern' English authors (not only poets); that he did not stand alone in his age, but there was at that time a wealth of 'sophisticated poetry'; that this poetry implies the existence of a 'rich and varied and humane English civilization'. These things are true; but Mr. Speirs is hardly the first to discover them.

DOROTHY EVERETT

The Secular Lyric in Middle English. By ARTHUR K. MOORE. Pp. x+255.

Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1951. \$4.00.

To the modern reader the secular lyrics are perhaps the most attractive of all medieval literature, and it is all the more surprising that no comprehensive study of them had previously appeared. This omission has now to some extent been made good by Professor Moore. His opening chapter deals with the origin and development of the secular lyric, pointing out that the extant English examples fall into two classes: the earlier minstrel lyric, essentially composed to be sung, and the later art lyric 'taking its impulse from artificial and restricted French forms and depending for its cultivation upon men of settled habits'. The minstrel lyrics, consisting in the main of the secular lyrics preserved in MS. Harley 2253, are first dealt with, and a further chapter discusses the satirical lyrics of the period. The art lyric, introduced by Chaucer and Gower and continued by their followers, is then considered, while a chapter on 'The Debris of the Transition' deals with the non-courtly lyrics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. A final chapter is concerned with the lyrical poems of Dunbar which may, in some respects, be regarded as compromises between the minstrel song and the art lyric.

This is a remarkably full and scholarly piece of work. Throughout, the Middle English lyrics are placed within the framework of contemporary European literature, and are more particularly related to the French lyrics of the period.

Quotation, from Middle English, French, and Latin, is frequent, adequate translations being provided in the case of quotations from the last two languages. Cross-references to the religious lyrics are necessarily frequent, and it is to be hoped that Professor Moore will some time give us a companion volume dealing with these.

The scattered literature on the subject has been dealt with comprehensively, but the author is by no means content to accept unquestioningly the judgements of past critics, and usually has his own contribution to make. Particularly valuable are his examination of and judgement on the art lyric, and he has much of interest to say about Dunbar's works, complaining that 'the conventional portrait of him as a Scottish Chaucerian is unfortunate in that it tends to obscure his original lyrical talent'. On the earlier lyrics he is so careful to avoid the fault of uncritical admiration that he may sometimes fail to give them their due.

The virtues of Professor Moore's book are obvious. Some chapters, perhaps naturally, read better than others, but occasional errors of fact are for the most part unimportant. For example, in 'Alysoun' the worms are usually taken as wooing under the clods rather than the clouds; in 'The Song of Lewes' the phrase 'to Douere-ward' is probably to be taken literally and not in the sense 'go into exile'; in the poem 'On the Death of Edward the Third' it is 'pe chualrye of pis lond' that is likened to a ship and not Edward himself. In addition some of the quotations show variations from the usual text, though it is only rarely that such differences are at all significant. More unfortunate is the somewhat ponderous style in which the book is written; the 'aureate diction' of the art lyric seems to have infected the author, with the result that there is a tendency to use unnecessarily obscure words, and occasionally a specialized critical jargon. At other times there is some carelessness in the choice of words, as for instance when the Scottish aristocracy of the early sixteenth century is called 'effete', though it is difficult to see why (Flodden would seem to disprove the charge effectively enough) unless the word be conceived of as one that automatically goes with 'aristocracy'. Points such as these, as well as the position of the notes at the end of the book instead of the foot of the page, make for difficult reading, and tend to obscure the value of what is certainly the best and fullest survey of the secular lyric in Middle English.

R. M. WILSON

Love's Labour's Lost. Edited by RICHARD DAVID. Pp. lii+196. (The Arden Shakespeare [new and revised edition]. General Editor: UNA ELLIS-FERMOR.) London: Methuen, 1951. 15s. net.

Mr. David's edition of *Love's Labour's Lost* is the second of the New Arden series, and if what I have to say appears unappreciative it is said in the hope that the General Editor and her team will find my suggestions constructive. Any edition by divers hands will inevitably vary in quality, but there should be a common effort to maintain a high standard of accuracy in the text and accompanying apparatus, an understanding of what the needs of students and teachers

are, and a recognition of what has been done in the past forty years (in the bibliographical and linguistic fields) towards the elucidation of the text and (equally important) what remains to be done. A superficial revision of the Old Arden edition will not necessarily give it a new lease of life. The New Arden edition should look forward and not backward if it is to serve the needs of the future as well as it has served the needs of the past.

The Introduction

The Introduction, in which Mr. David deals with four main topics (the Text, Date, Sources, and Topical Context) does not seem to me a serviceable introduction for students. Mr. David has only a hazy notion of what is implied by terms such as 'bad quarto', 'good quarto', and 'copyright'; in consequence he writes so confusedly on bibliographical and related matters that no one who did not know what he should be saying would guess what he was trying to express. Most of the section on the text is devoted to the question of revision. He accepts Dover Wilson's explanation of certain features of the quarto (its variations in typography and nomenclature and its duplicated matter) and summarily dismisses Greg's. But if it is the aim of the New Arden edition to bring its critical apparatus up to date, this is the wrong way to set about it. The New Cambridge Shakespeare (of which the edition of *Love's Labour's Lost* appeared in 1923) was a landmark, but not a terminus. In 1930 (M.L.R.) what Dover Wilson claimed, on looking back over the thirteen plays then published, was 'to have raised problems and elucidated facts for which explanations will sooner or later have to be found. In other words, the chief business of a textual editor at the present juncture is to set the right puzzles; the solutions he himself offers are of minor importance.' This was, of course, a modest claim but a wise one, and those who have since wrestled with the problems to which he so rightly drew attention would claim no greater finality for their solutions. What alternatives have since been put forward should, however, be recorded. Greg's interpretation of what lies behind the quarto expressed not only his own views but those, for instance, of Chambers and McKerrow, and they seem to command wide assent. Mr. David should therefore have covered his prescribed course down to the position in 1950. When he has done this he can, of course (since an editor is entitled to express his own views), return to the 1923 position if he wishes to.

Mr. David is on safer ground and covers it much more adequately in the sections on the Date, Sources, and Topical Content, though the last of these sections seems to me, like the section on the Text, lopsided. Students must, of course, be told that many critics see in *Love's Labour's Lost* a reflection of controversies and personalities of the fifteen-nineties, but there are more profitable and more literary interpretations they need to understand. That Shakespeare was interested in the Marprelate Controversy is a surmise; we know that he took a considerable interest (in earnest and in jest) in his medium, especially in words and style, and in no play is this so evident as in *Love's Labour's Lost*. Much more of its 'wytt & mirthe' depends on parody of styles and verbal ingenuity than students will recognize for themselves.

The Text

Mr. David rightly bases his text on the quarto (1598). Some forty-odd readings rejected in favour of the Folio's by Hart are accordingly restored. There is also one entirely convincing return to a quarto reading which has customarily been rejected. Following a suggestion of Granville-Barker's, Mr. David restores 'The party is gone' (v. ii. 661) to Armado, as part of his set-piece as Hector. It should, however, have been explained that 'party' refers to Hector ('the sweet war-man is dead') and that, in interpreting 'gone' in the sense of 'gone with child', Costard attached to the word an older and more usual significance than Armado, whose 'gone' in the sense of 'dead' was less usual and even perhaps affected. The return to the quarto reading is an important one: the pageant of the Worthies, very appropriately, is brought to a riotous end by an equivocation.

Mr. David's treatment of the quarto text is conservative. He makes many of the customary emendations, though a few that have established themselves seem to me unnecessary or even wrong. At iv. i. 143, for instance, the emendation 'to th' one side' (for the quarto's 'ath toothen side') seems to rest on a misunderstanding. Costard is making a mental comparison between Boyet on the one hand and on the other hand ('ath toother side') Armado and Moth, neither of whom would have been so easily put down as Boyet, and all that is wanted is the correction of the quarto's 'toothen' to 'toother'. To interpret 'side' in a literal sense loses the point and leads to the unnecessary suggestion that Costard's lines imply a lost scene in which there was some comic business between Armado and his page.

Every editor will, of course, leave on his text the impression of his own personality. One will be more conservative than another, and another more adventurous. Often an editor may be in the unenviable position of not knowing what to do for the best. Over some emendations, however, there should be no hesitation. Hart came to the extraordinary conclusion that the failure of a word to rhyme was no excuse for emending it. Mr. David endorses this perverse opinion and accordingly preserves, like Hart, the quarto's 'sworn' (for 'swore') at i. i. 114 as a rhyme to 'more'; 'affection' (for 'affectation') at v. ii. 407 as a rhyme to 'ostentation'; and 'fight; yea' (for 'fight ye') at v. ii. 644 as a rhyme to 'almighty'. The quarto readings at i. i. 104 ('any abortive birth'), iv. iii. 302 ('poisons up'), v. ii. 338 ('madman'), and v. ii. 753 ('straying') are equally objectionable as blemishes on the metre or the sense. As a devoted disciple of McKerrow, Mr. David believes that 'wherever a conceivable explanation can be made out' for the quarto reading it should be preserved; but what is conceivable or 'can be made out' as sense is not necessarily poetry; 'poisons up' does not even strike me as tolerable English. This is not at all the kind of conservatism McKerrow had in mind or practised. He would have seen in these quarto readings merely instances of some of the commonest types of compositor's errors and would have corrected them. An editor does well to refrain from emending, except where he is compelled to, the difficult, elliptical language of the later plays; but in the early plays, where the language is more explicit, the metrical structure formal, and rhyme and rhetoric often provide clear indications

of what is wanted, there is no excuse for timidity. It is not in reason that every compositor's blunder should fail to produce a word or even an approximation to sense; and, in the circumstances, to emend 'affection' to 'affectation' is no different from emending 'prosperie' to 'prosperity' (without even mentioning the alteration) at I. i. 296. Hart's procedure, endorsed (though, I judge, not always happily) by Mr. David, is not even consistent. Rhymes might apparently be restored in couplets, but not in quatrains; the syllable required for the metre at II. i. 39 was restored (following Capell), but the syllable required for both the metre and the rhetoric at III. i. 186 (where Malone's emendation is clearly wanted) was not.

Conservatism has, however, its compensations. Though puzzled by them, Mr. David retains (as some modern editors do not) Berowne's 'O's of II. i. 213, III. i. 141, &c. Like Armado's 'O's of III. i. 27, they express the pangs of love. This is evident from Armado's rebuke of Moth's wilful misinterpretation of his sighs as the lament for the hobby-horse ('Call'st thou my love hobby-horse?'). Their significance is therefore dramatic and not bibliographical.

The proof-reading of the text leaves something to be desired. Two errors in Hart's edition have escaped correction:

v. ii. 282: you will hear?	<i>for</i> will you hear?
v. ii. 576: neighbour	good neighbour.

Another five have crept in:

I. i. 139: thither	<i>for</i> hither
I. i. 236: preposterous	most preposterous
I. i. 290: With	Which
IV. ii. 21: <i>haud credo</i>	a <i>haud credo</i>
V. ii. 68: would	should.

The Collation Notes

The collation notes contain a steady succession of errors and neither their completeness nor their accuracy can be relied on. Some of the errors are a legacy from the Old Cambridge Shakespeare, whose editors were not at the top of their form in the collation notes to this play, and their notes were seemingly taken on trust by Hart. Hart's notes, in their turn, have been reproduced by Mr. David. Notes are omitted in the Old Cambridge Shakespeare (and consequently in the Old and New Arden editions) on the quarto readings at II. i. 131 ('of, of') and IV. i. 6 ('Ore');¹ and at v. ii. 730 Theobald's reading is 'part' (not 'past'). Six further omissions are a legacy from Hart: at I. i. 127, I. i. 296, I. i. 297, I. i. 298, I. ii. 49, IV. iii. 181-4 (the Old Cambridge Shakespeare has notes on all these). Most of the rest are literal errors, partly derived from the Old Cambridge edition, but partly, I suspect, due to Mr. David's having substituted in his text the quarto reading for Hart's Folio reading and then having

¹ On correcting the proofs of this review I find that it was the Old Arden edition (and not the Old Cambridge edition) which omitted the collation note on 'Ore' at IV. i. 6.

given Hart's modernized spelling as the Folio's. What the Cambridge editors cited as Rowe ii (as at iv. iii. 115 and elsewhere) is now known to be Rowe iii.

The New Arden edition would, I think, have done well to cut out a great deal of the dead wood in the collation notes. It may be the general policy of the new edition to give, in all cases, the readings of the later quartos and F 2-4, but where the readings of derivative texts later than the First Folio are plainly compositors' errors no useful purpose is served by citing them. Until surviving copies of the First Folio have been collated, the readings of any quarto based upon it and the readings of F 2 must, of course, be carefully scrutinized, but in the case of *Love's Labour's Lost*, where the Folio text has not independent authority, the readings of F 2-4 that are plainly compositors' errors could, with propriety, be ignored. Thus at i. i. 77, F 2-4 omit 'of light' in the line 'Light seeking light doth light of light beguile'. The loss of these two words can only have been due to the compositor's eye having skipped them and a collation note on the omission is unnecessary. Of no significance in an edition of this kind are the errors of F 3 (e.g. 'cares' for F 1's 'ears' and Q 1's 'eare' at v. ii. 743).

It is, of course, too much to expect the New Arden editors to collate existing copies of the early text on which their own is based. Where this is a Folio text it is clearly impossible and where (as for this play) the most authoritative text is a quarto, existing copies may be so numerous or so scattered that collation is not feasible. But where existing copies are known to differ it should be possible for the New Arden editor to give a critical account of the variants and their character. The note on the 'Ione'/'Loue' variant at iv. iii. 180 is woefully confused. Further, as he should read his text with one original, a list of the doubtful or erroneous readings in the best available facsimile would be welcome and workmanlike. The only facsimile of this play is the Griggs facsimile, one of a notoriously unreliable series. At i. i. 214-15, for instance, it has the inspired malapropism for Costard 'Such is the simplicie of man to harken after the flesh'. Is 'simplicie' merely a ghost reading?

An editor who takes the risk of basing his text on a predecessor's hazards much. The Old Cambridge editors did not aim at recording all the features of the early texts in their collation notes. At iv. ii. 104, &c., the foolish 'staff', 'stanze', or 'verse' ('If love make me forsorn . . .'), which Nathaniel found 'very learned', has in the quarto a comma after every sixth syllable in every one of its fourteen lines. The Cambridge editors suppressed five of these caesura points, and Hart, followed by Mr. David, six. The quarto pointing is as deliberate in its own way as that of the Pyramus and Thisbe Prologue, and the mechanical internal pauses, which a scrutiny of the quarto would have brought to light, should, of course, be preserved, as they provide the key to Holofernes's very just censure of the lines in the following speech.

The Explanatory Notes

The explanatory notes of Hart's edition have been both pruned and augmented. What has gone could well be spared and what is added is to the good; but the revision has not been nearly drastic enough. Hart's edition, first published in 1906, included much illustrative material that became redundant when

the *O.E.D.* was completed. It is understandable that a feeling of piety may have prompted the New Arden editor to preserve as much as he could find room for of Hart's work. This seems to me a mistake. The needs of schools and university students would be far better served by less illustration and more explanation. Apropos of 'extemporal' at I. ii. 173 we find, for instance:

Compare G. Harvey (Grosart, i. 111), 1579: 'To his very unfriendly frende that procurid the edition of his so slender and extemporall devises.'

This sort of thing is no use. It does not explain the meaning of 'extemporal' for those who have not the wit to deduce it, and those who boggle at the meaning of this word are unlikely to know what 'devises' are. Too many of Hart's notes, like this one, say nothing to the purpose and need another note to explain them. Thus at I. ii. 40 there is the following note on 'gamester':

player, gambler. So in Cooke's *Greene's Tu Quoque*: 'Primero! why I thought thou hadst not been so much gamester as to play at it.'

A student is unlikely to know anything about 'primero'. If he has the enterprise to discover its meaning, he will find it was a card game and may be confirmed in the natural, but erroneous, supposition that 'deuce-ace' at I. ii. 44 (on which there is no note) refers to cards. He may turn to the fact that the reference is to dice if he reads the inordinately long note (some seven inches of it) on the dancing horse at I. ii. 51, since mid-way through there emerges the interesting information that, in a tract of 1596, Banks's horse is represented as 'on his hind legs, and at his feet two dice, one of which has ace uppermost, the other the deuce to the front'. Sometimes nothing useful emerges. The long quotation from Puttenham at III. i. 1 fails to explain that 'passionate' in Elizabethan English had not its present-day restricted meaning. At IV. ii. 22 the note on 'Twice-sod simplicity, *bis coctus*' does not explain 'sod'; 'twice-sodden coleworts' does not strike me as a helpful gloss and quoting the Greek form of the proverb, followed by some difficult Latin, serves no useful purpose. The first need is to explain 'sod' and, for those who may wish to pursue the matter, a reference to the *Adagia* of Erasmus is enough.

The emphasis is now, I think, on the need for students (at school or the university) to understand the significance of Shakespearian words that have changed in meaning since the sixteenth century rather than on the need to explain allusions of the remoter kind. It is more important that they should know what 'wink' means at I. i. 43, 'conceit' at II. i. 72, 'tales' at II. i. 74, 'sensibly' at III. i. 111 (a few of the many words which are now current in a restricted or changed meaning but are passed by without comment in this edition) than that they should be tempted to think they are doing very nicely if they memorize the obliquities of Hart's notes. Much of the fun to be got out of this play will be lost if they do not understand the meaning of words and the point of the equivocations. Not all teachers of English in schools are experts on Elizabethan English and to appreciate many of the more subtle semantic changes that have taken place since Shakespeare's day calls for more linguistic training than some have had. Further, it is not every student or teacher who has the time or the

facilities to work with a battery of editions, a Shakespeare Concordance, and the *O.E.D.* in the hope of reaching a clearer understanding of the meaning of the text. What is wanted is a more imaginative effort on the part of the editor to meet their needs.

Love's Labour's Lost was undoubtedly a very difficult assignment. Mr. David's edition suggests inexperience and lack of guidance, rather than negligence. When he knows what he is doing he is thorough and capable of taking the necessary trouble over work of this kind. I hope that in any future play he edits he will have more confidence in his own judgement and take a firmer line with the work of his predecessor. Hart's legacy is undoubtedly an awkward one. No one who has edited an Elizabethan text can fail to recognize the value of his notes as a mine of information on many topics, but they are by no means as serviceable to the student of 1952 as they were to the student of 1906, and the emphasis in future years is, I fancy, likely to be increasingly on those aspects of Elizabethan English to which he paid less attention than some of his fellow editors of the Old Arden edition.

ALICE WALKER

The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, why, and how it was written by Shakespeare. By HENRY N. PAUL. Pp. xiv+438. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. \$6.00.

This is a long and discursive monograph based upon half a century's reading about, and reflections upon, *Macbeth*, in such moments of leisure as a busy lawyer from Philadelphia could command. In short, it is the work of an amateur, though of an amateur in the better sense of the word. Mr. Henry N. Paul, for the last fifteen years 'dean' of the Shakespeare Society of Philadelphia, in succession to H. H. Furness, jun., is well known to scholars in America, and many names familiar to us over here are mentioned among the acknowledgements in his preface.

He seems to me at times to lack, indeed, a sense of evidence, which is curious in a lawyer; ventilating a questionable theory on one page and proceeding to argue from it as a fact later in the book, while his textual notions are often odd, to say the least of it. A single example will illustrate both points. On p. 29 he propounds the remarkable theory that 'Shakespeare began the composition of his play' at 'How far is 't called to Forres?' (1. iii. 39); the only reason given being that Holinshed begins his tale of the encounter with the Weird Sisters at much the same point. On p. 32, however, this first theory is found to be connected with a second, viz. 'that 1. ii was hastily written after the play was otherwise finished'. Finally, in a chapter entitled 'The Bleeding Sergeant Scene' (pp. 332 ff.) we discover that the second theory is based on yet a third, which in its turn involves others as well. Summing them up, the patent imperfections of 1. ii show that the scene was left unfinished; it was left unfinished because the performance of the play at court had unexpectedly to be put forward a week or two; the performance was put forward because King Christian VI, becoming bored with his brother-in-law, had suddenly decided to go home. For all this the only apparent evidence is the textual condition of 1. ii and the fact that

Christian returned to Denmark earlier than a date originally fixed. I am myself sometimes accused of building conjecture upon conjecture; but Mr. Paul can do better, or build higher, than that. I hope I do not misrepresent him, and that this statement will not put readers of *R.E.S.* off from his book, which contains much information and many suggestions of real value.

The following points, for example, seemed of special interest, and were for the most part new to me:

(i) The principal source of the play, Mr. Paul contends, was, after Holinshed, the *Rerum Scoticarum Historia* by George Buchanan (pp. 212-19). He cites a number of parallels, 'mainly relating to the workings of the minds of the characters rather than to their acts', including a reference to Macbeth being spurred on 'by the incessant and loud-voiced reproaches of his wife' and to his 'ardent disposition, lofty spirit, and ambition for great things'.¹ It was the absence from Holinshed of just such points as these two that led me to follow Mrs. Stopes in looking to Stewart as a possible source. I am not accepting Buchanan without further consideration, but if he, who will certainly have read Stewart, be found a source, we are absolved from turning elsewhere. The suggestion was, it appears, derived from a hint in an edition by Liddell which is unknown to me and described by Paul as 'hard to get'. But George Buchanan, King James's old tutor! One ought to have thought of him.

(ii) Paul connects the change of 'Makdowald' (Holinshed) to 'Macdonwald' (i. ii. 9) with James's suppression in 1605 of a certain Angus Macdonald, a rebellious chieftain in the Western Isles.

(iii) According to Holinshed, again, Macbeth and Banquo follow up the campaign against Makdowald by defeating two separate *Danish* invasions of Fife, one by Sweno, King of Norway, and the other by Canute of England. Paul plausibly suggests that all reference to the Danes was cut out of Scene ii by Shakespeare in deference to Christian VI (pp. 343-5). Certain textual speculations accompanying these paragraphs seem to me less than plausible.

(iv) In the same way he finds an allusion in the strikingly sympathetic account at i. iv. 7-11 of the behaviour of Cawdor on the scaffold to the similar bearing of the young and handsome Sir Everard Digby, who, though befriended by James, was brought to the gallows on 30 January 1606 for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot (pp. 233-6).

(v) Another topical reference, this time in Macbeth's description at iv. i. 52 ff., to the power of witches over winds and waves, is discovered in contemporary accounts of a hurricane which struck the Low Countries on 2 April 1606, destroying churches, blowing down towers, and causing tidal waves of an immensely destructive character (pp. 248 ff.).

(vi) Malone first suggested 1606 as the year, and the visit to the English court of Christian VI as the occasion, on which *Macbeth*, as we now have it, 'was originally produced; and a good deal of Mr. Paul's book is devoted to an account of such incidents of this visit and events of this year as he professes to find reflected in the play. One of the most convincing of these reflections is the

¹ The translations are mine.

passage at iv. iii. 97-100 in which Malcolm, affecting the tyrant, protests to Macduff:

Nay, had I power, I should
Pour the sweet milk of concord into hell,
Uproar the universal peace, confound
All unity on earth.

Here Paul detects a reference to the recorded 'uproar' by a mob on 31 July 1606 as James and Christian passed in procession through the streets of London. An elaborate 'pageant' had been erected in Cheapside, the principal figures representing Concord, Peace, and Unity, words dear to James's heart and the three aims of his foreign policy. Peace, however, with Spain and unity among nations (in particular between those on either side of the Tweed) were anything but popular with large numbers of the English. Thus when Divine Concord began 'an excellent speech in Latine, purporting their heartie welcome, with the heavenly happines of peace and unitie amongst Christian Princes', the words, to the horror of all loyal subjects, were drowned 'through the distemperature of the unrulie multitude' (pp. 359-66). As I had earlier shown that the 'milk of concord' passage was an addition to Shakespeare's MS., this linking of it up with an event belonging to the last day of July 1606 came as a welcome confirmation.

J. DOVER WILSON

Readings on the Character of Hamlet 1661-1947. Compiled from over three hundred sources by CLAUDE C. H. WILLIAMSON. Pp. xiv+783. London: Allen & Unwin, 1950. 45s. net.

Mr. Williamson's is a queer and rather heroic performance. He has produced what the publishers of children's books like to call a bumper volume, with all our old favourites and legions of newcomers as well. The dust-jacket announces that 'This large volume contains the essence of over 300 great literary critics'. As to just what sort of greatness is sometimes involved there may be what Mr. Williamson calls 'much dispute and critical issue'. But there can be little doubt that many of his great critics write badly, and none at all that their editor is here resolved to keep them in countenance. Mr. Williamson's single-page introduction is a little show-piece of grammatical chaos, logical confusion, and mild oddity. 'Finally', he writes, 'it is interesting to conjecture what many famous men of the past (who have not written about the play) may have said about Shakespeare's masterpiece, e.g., Milton, Swift, Gissing, and Arnold. Even at this stage I have had to omit about sixty extracts from various sources, in order not to lengthen the book.' This is mysterious—but then, of course, *Hamlet* is mysterious too.

When we turn to the body of the work we are likely to feel that the editor could with advantage have omitted a good deal more. For example, there is this from John Downes: 'No succeeding Tragedy for several years got more Reputation, or money to the Company than this'; and five pages later we read: 'Writing to Sir Horace Mann on May 24, 1760, Horace Walpole mentions that before the execution of Lord Ferrers, *Hamlet* was read to the prisoner at his own request.'

ests to
y 1606
n. An
repre-
three
ations
ing but
began
h the
words,
ure of
'milk
it up
con-
ON

over
ondon:

uced
ch all
ances
tistics'.
Mr.
oubt
here
atro-
mild
ous
bout
n at
order
et is

itor
this
nta-
ing
the
st.'

It can scarcely be said that much light on the character of Hamlet is cast by this—any more than it is, at the other end of the book, by the 3,000 words of theatrical reminiscence excerpted from the late Charles B. Cochran's *A Showman Looks On*, or by Mr. John Gielgud's extended musings on costumes and scenery. To be brief, Mr. Williamson's conception of what he is about is substantially—or insubstantially—nebulous, and one can only wonder at the cloudy progress through millions of words of print that must lie behind his monstrous compilation. Nor do the proportions observed seem very sensible. The 324 excerpts are arranged chronologically according to the date of publication. No. 20 takes us to Dr. Samuel Johnson; no. 65 to Dr. Ray, writing in the *American Journal of Insanity* for April, 1847; no. 106 to Dr. Onimus in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1876; and no. 211 to Dr. Ernest Jones in 1923. Of the 771 pages of text 537 are given to matter published within the present century. For the purposes of a representative selection of significant writing on Hamlet—or even on *Hamlet*—the net has clearly been woven of too fine a mesh. Mr. Williamson takes as epigraph a phrase from one of Keats's letters: 'Now I shall relish Hamlet more than I ever have done.' But he might with at least equal aptness have turned to Yeats:

Shakespearean fish swam the sea, far away from land;
Romantic fish swam in nets coming to the hand;
What are all those fish that lie gasping on the strand?

The book is on the whole carefully produced. J. Churton Colleg (p. 775) ought perhaps to have existed but in fact did not. There is an even stranger misprint on p. 358.

J. I. M. STEWART

Law Tricks. By JOHN DAY. [Edited by JOHN CROW.] Pp. xvi+[71] (Malone Society Reprint). Oxford: Malone Society, 1949 (1950).

This lively and inventive but somewhat incoherent comedy by Day is decidedly one of the minor plays of its period, perhaps also of its author; and in view of Bullen's old-spelling (though, of course, repunctuated) text of 1881, its reprinting was not quite so urgent as that of some other plays the Malone Society has given us. But Bullen's privately printed edition of Day has never been widely available and its text, though substantially accurate, as one would expect, does not quite come up to the demands of modern scholarship. In particular its textual notes are sporadic and it fails to indicate all its emendations, well judged as most of these are. So there will be a welcome for this new reprint, especially among those Elizabethan scholars who may think Day has been more neglected than some other dramatists of equal rank. One interesting problem for the specialists which has never been thoroughly investigated concerns the nature of his collaboration with Wilkins, whose participation in *Law Tricks* Robert Boyle once argued with some force.

The play is dated by a topical reference with fair certainty in 1604, and the sole edition in its own day was the quarto of 1608. The reprint, ably prepared by Mr. John Crow with the assistance of the past and present general editors of

the Society, Sir Walter Greg and Professor F. P. Wilson, shows the usual scholarly accuracy and care. If there are any errors in it my sample checking has not discovered them. It is true that I should have taken the comma after 'foole' in line 696 to be a semicolon in each of the British Museum copies, but this is one of those doubtful cases which abound in poorly printed quartos and on which no one should argue with an editor whose work elsewhere shows excellent judgement and who has the advantage of having collated six copies. Beyond these six English copies Mr. Crow has been able to make use of the collation of six American copies by Mr. William Peery, whose results were published in *The Library* in 1947; and two further American copies have also been consulted. It might have been convenient for some future scholar if the two which have not been fully collated had been distinguished in the list on page vi; but it is possible to infer that they were the Kemble-Devonshire copy in the Huntington and the copy in the New York Public Library.

The correction of the quarto during printing led to variants in seven formes, of which two occur in three states and one in as many as four. And this, of course, made Mr. Crow's a complicated task. For although he had the *Library* article to go on, his own collations have revealed for the outer forme of A a third state which his predecessor had not seen and a dozen or so of variant readings which Mr. Peery seems to have overlooked. In addition, the order of states suggested by Mr. Peery is now in three instances reversed, and although two of these are a matter of opinion the judgement of the Malone editor will probably be generally endorsed.

This intricacy of variation is very clearly laid out in the introduction. The nature of the quarto has also required a somewhat longer list than usual of 'irregular and doubtful readings', which has been prepared with much care. There are, however, some omissions, including, I take it, l. 827 'ith the' (cf. 1054), ll. 984-5 'Cuck-|kold', l. 2075 'about', the absence of a comma at l. 1686, and the presence of a turned full stop at l. 969. The list has also a few gate-crashers, unless I misunderstand what the function of such a list should be. No competent Elizabethan scholar will require a certificate of textual accuracy when he meets 'I' for 'Ay' (1808), 'balle' for 'base' (761), 'vngiue' for 'ungyve' (1973). All perfectly acceptable Elizabethan spellings, these are surely not 'irregular' readings at all.

HAROLD JENKINS

Milton's Imagery. By THEODORE HOWARD BANKS. Pp. xiv+260. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1950. \$3.50; 22s. 6d. net.

Since Miss Spurgeon's *Shakespeare's Imagery* the investigation of a poet's mind through his imagery has become a favourite method of literary diagnosis, and Milton was due for examination by this method; Dr. Banks has made a good beginning, particularly in the exploration of the less familiar ground of Milton's prose. He has undertaken to analyse the content of Milton's imagery (defining 'image' as figure of speech) in order to 'reveal the writer's fields of interest: his preoccupations and beliefs, his likes and dislikes, his knowledge or ignorance,

his experience or lack of it, in short, his personality'. His interest therefore is biographical rather than literary. As is the way of such biographical investigators, he does not distinguish between the writer and the man or citizen; and often he tacitly confuses them. His evidence is what Milton wrote and is valid evidence about Milton the writer; but at any moment he may be found using it as equally valid evidence about Mr. Milton, whose personality and circumstances are not necessarily the same.

Dr. Banks disposes his evidence under the following chapter headings: London Public Life, London Private Life, Travel and War, Nature, Animals, Books and Learning. He draws more largely on the prose than the verse, and usually presents the quotations from the prose first; his investigation of the prose imagery is, as I have already suggested, the most valuable part of the book. But he seems rather less interested in the poetry, perhaps because he feels it is not so near the 'real life' of Milton as the prose; at any rate his treatment of the poetry is less thorough, and he fails on more than one occasion properly to follow up the imagery of the prose as it appears in the poetry. For instance, he illustrates from the prose the frequency of images to do with the hands, but has nothing to say of the prominence and importance of the hand symbolism in *Paradise Lost*. Again, he observes that images drawn from road travel are rare and not very interesting in Milton's writings; he quotes a few examples, all from the prose, yet none of these is so striking as the 'night-founder' of *Comus*, which he omits. Many readers will find the chief value of Dr. Banks's examples from the prose to be in their bearing on the poetry; this value however remains, and perhaps one is being somewhat ungrateful in complaining that the object of his study does not encourage him to make the most of his admirable collection of material.

It is only to be expected that, with his biographical approach, Dr. Banks will be found sometimes forcing the evidence to make a biographical point. Although he draws attention to the fallacy of 'the argument from silence', he himself is sometimes guilty of arguing from negative evidence. On page 33 he observes that Milton's images from the drama, 'even those of masques, are written from the point of view of a spectator; Milton never takes us to a rehearsal or backstage. From this circumstance we might reasonably infer that he was not involved in the performance of *Comus*, as nothing is more likely to make an impression on an amateur than his first share in the production of a play.' This is what comes of arguing from letters to life. Another example occurs in the section on Milton's images of the sea, which, as Dr. Banks says, are among the most individual of Milton's nature images. He cites an interesting series of passages from the prose, showing accurate observation of sea and rivers and ports, of sailing and navigation and naval warfare; all these are taken from the first prose tracts, written immediately after Milton's return from his continental tour, and Dr. Banks infers therefrom that it was Milton's crossing of the Channel and his voyage from Nice to Genoa which awakened his interest in these matters. 'In his youth he seems to have been indifferent to the sea, . . . and up to 1639 he has only a few commonplaces referring to it': this is strangely to overlook *Lycidas*. He admits that several of the finest sea figures are found in the later poems, but suggests that these 'may well reflect the still vivid memories of this episode of his youth'. The

fact is that Milton is among our chief poets of the sea; and Dr. Banks's citations from the prose would have been better directed to illustrating the intent and accurate observation that lies behind the seafaring imagery of the poetry than to this perverse attempt to discover a biographical titbit.

Dr. Banks produces some interesting evidence on Milton's sense impressions. He remarks that, 'as with everyone else, the overwhelming majority of his sense impressions were visual', and that this remained so even after blindness. Yet Milton's visual imagery, on Dr. Banks's showing, is not the most notable; his impressions of form are clear and sharp, but his sense of colour is undiscriminating. The images of smell, sound, and touch are more distinctive, and after blindness become more evident; Dr. Banks rightly notes that Milton's sense of touch is peculiarly sensitive. He provides new evidence of the strongly bookish trend of Milton's interest by showing that the images from writing, publishing, and printing are, in the prose, unusually frequent, detailed, and original. There is of course no danger of a reader's overlooking the fact that Milton draws much of his material from books; what he is more apt to miss is the appeal to the contemporary world that often animates this imagery. Dr. Banks, for instance, puts among the purely literary similes these lines from the description of the causeway built by Sin and Death:

As when two Polar Winds blowing adverse
Upon the *Cronian* Sea, together drive
Mountains of Ice, that stop th' imagin'd way
Beyond *Petora* Eastward, to the rich
Cathaian Coast.

He does not seem to realize how much of the heroic endeavour and mental excitement of the age are contained in this and the other similes in *Paradise Lost* which are drawn from the voyages of travel and discovery. If we are to argue from the poet to the man and his times, here is God's plenty.

B. A. WRIGHT

The Plays and Poems of William Cartwright. Edited with Introductions and Notes by G. BLAKEMORE EVANS. Pp. xiv+861. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1951. \$13.50.

I will turn
Poet my self, it is in fashion, Lady:
Hee's scarce a Courtier now, that hath not writ
His brace of Plaies.

So speaks Prusias in Cartwright's *The Siedge*. A literary courtier-don of a kind not uncommon in the Laudian era, Cartwright was esteemed a great success in his double role, and has been neglected by editors ever since. When even Mar-mion's and Cokain's plays achieved reprints in the last century, Cartwright's were laid aside. In this sumptuous edition Professor Blakemore Evans has most handsomely made amends: three of the four plays appear for the first time since

Works (1651); a generous provision of introductory matter ensures that no reader need remain ignorant of Cartwright's background, his career at Oxford, and his relations with the court. His reputation has fluctuated curiously: Charles Kingsley called him a 'wondrous youth'; Pope seems to have misread him; Aaron Hill probably stole from him, and, earlier, he enjoyed his little 'school' of which the Matchless Orinda was the bright particular star.

Cartwright's works, as Professor Evans says, do not raise any large textual problems. His editor has collated four copies of the 1651 *Works*, the sole authority for three of the plays and about half the poems. For the fourth play, *The Royall Slave*, the quarto of 1639 has been taken as the basic text, and variant readings recorded from the four manuscripts of this play, from its second quarto (1640) and from *Works*. Each poem is given from the earliest printed text, except in some cases where a manuscript has been used. A section of doubtful poems contains the 'Splendora' series (seven poems claimed for Cartwright when they were first printed in 1639) and one other piece. At least two of Cartwright's plays, *The Lady-Errant* and *The Ordinary*, were revived in the Restoration period; Professor Evans describes, and records in his textual commentary, the deletions and alterations found in the Restoration prompt-copies of these two plays. These are printed versions (the text being that of *Works*) which have been variously censored by the Revels Office, and pruned by the players, for productions in 1671. I note here that in the text of *The Siedge* (II. i. 510) the word 'poffet-drink' seems to result from a double long 's' escaping modernization.

As much information about the four plays as most will desire is provided in the editor's introductions to each. Cartwright's sources, on Professor Evans's showing, range from *The Alchemist* (*The Ordinary*) to works which one has not read right through just lately, such as Barnabe Brissonius's *De Regio Persarum Principatu* and Theodorus Prodromus's *Rhodanthes et Dosiclis Amorum* (*The Royall Slave*). There is a very informative account of the most interesting episode in Cartwright's career, and perhaps in the stage history of the last Caroline decade: the double performance in 1636-7 of *The Royall Slave*—at Oxford by the students of Christ Church and at Hampton Court by the King's Men.

Professor Evans's critical commentary is not always so admirably full as his several introductions. 'In the matter of annotation', he writes, 'I have made no attempt to gloss words and phrases which will be clear to anyone with some knowledge of Elizabethan and Caroline drama.' This is, of course, an acceptable policy, but it is not always easy for an editor to decide what allusions, linguistic, classical or otherwise, such a reader may be relied upon to grasp. If, in commenting on Cartwright's impressive tribute to Jonson, it was necessary to refer line 41 to its Horatian analogue, there is a claim for annotating the line about serving 'Thyestes bloody supper in, | As if it had onely a *sallad bin*' (ll. 115-16: cf. Hor. *A.P.*, 88), as well as the allusion to Catullus xvi in lines 87-8 ('nam castum esse decet pium poetam | ipsum, versiculos nihil necessest'). In other poems we find some small puzzles which, if the note on Linus be justified (*Lady-Errant*, I. iv. 314), call for elucidation. Such are the allusions to Scaevola's hand (p. 458), to Miniver (p. 455, presumably a reference to the fur on academical caps and gowns):

see Gifford's note, *Plays of Philip Massinger*, 1853, p. 400), and the rather obscure one to Hippolytus ('On the Imperfection of *Christ Church Buildings*', ll. 9-10: here, since the poem is a plea for the restoration of the buildings, one suspects that Cartwright intended his readers to grasp an allusion to Hippolytus as Virbius). The several biblical allusions in the eclogue in honour of Brian Duppia were worth sorting out: the Bishop and his royal pupil are allusively compared to Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and Christ. In the second poem on Fletcher I have noted two references which seem to call for editorial notice: the first is an interesting comparison of Fletcher with Dürer, which shows an acquaintance with a popular and still current idea of the great artist's methods (Dürer's *Treatise on Proportion* did not appear in English dress until 1660); the second reference, lines 67-8, just before the celebrated passage on Shakespeare—'We did doubt | In which Scene we laught most two shillings out'—appears to indicate the current price of admission to a private theatre, mounting steeply in Cartwright's time. Reverting to *The Siedge*, one notes an echo of Donne's compass image (iv. viii. 1783-7) striking enough to merit observation, and in the same play Professor Evans could have thrown light on the character of the widow Pyle if he had adduced a few analogues to the various descriptions of her ugliness. These, with their disgusting details, are of a conventionalized kind which seems to have been popular in the Caroline period. They spring perhaps from Tasso's stanzas 'Sopra la Bellezza', which were translated by Drummond of Hawthornden in his poem 'Thiris in dispraise of Beauty' (see the edition of Drummond by Kastner, i. 131-2 and notes); the convention was carried on by, amongst others, Suckling ('The Deformed Mistress', *Works*, ed. Thompson, p. 59) and Shirley in his play *The Duke's Mistress* (see especially Horatio's speech in II. i, *Works*, ed. Dyce, 1833, iv. 207-8).

Cartwright had a wide and curious vocabulary and a decorous sense of the necessary distinctions in speech between a Platonic lover and a 'cheater' like Shape in *The Ordinary*. The elaborate culinary joke in *The Ordinary* (II. ii) and the bastard Chaucerianism of Moth the antiquary in the same play also testify that the dramatist took, as befits an academic poet, a playful interest in words. Perhaps the strangest example in Professor Evans's commentary is *Chin, Chin*, 'an Anglo-Chinese phrase of salutation' (*Lady-Errant*, v. i. 1760; earliest hitherto recorded in *O.E.D.*, 1795). But there are some words, and cruxes, which it is surprising to find Professor Evans passing over in silence. *Turn Stile*, for example (*Lady-Errant*, v. i. 1809), is the first *O.E.D.* recording of this word. On the same page of *The Lady-Errant*, Philaenius's intention to 'stand upon a Cricket, and there make | Fluent Orations' needs glossing: this is also the first *O.E.D.* recorded use of *cricket* ('a low stool'). *Achme* (*Lady-Errant*, III. ii. 874) is an early example of *ἀκμή* transliterated, and in the same speech *frontispiece* in its architectural sense was worth a comment (Laud's classical 'frontispiece' in the Canterbury Quadrangle of St. John's College was completed in 1636, and may have helped to make an Oxford poet frontispiece-conscious). A rare word which Cartwright uses twice is *veget* (*O.E.D.* *vegete* < L. *vegetus*, 'lively'; see Professor Evans's note on p. 653) and this bears on the conjecture that Jonson meant 'lively person' when he wrote *vegetall* in *The Alchemist*, II. ii. 256 (see the Oxford Jonson,

x. 85). In *The Royall Slave*, *specious* in the sense of 'beautiful and worthy' (I. ii. 146) requires a gloss, and so also does the strange word *sullying* (I. ii. 217, not in *O.E.D.*): Cartwright is using a metaphor from metal founding—'As if the sullying | Must turne all purer mettle into drosse'—and his word seems therefore to be connected with *sullage*, 'metal scoria or slag', of which the first recorded instance in *O.E.D.* is 1843.

Turning back to the poems, one notes that the hyperbole in Cartwright's commendatory poem in Killigrew's volume of 1641, where he writes of certain dramatic authors who, unlike Killigrew, breed like the elephant and with labour bear 'a saecular play', could have been enriched by reference to *O.E.D. secular* ii. 5. The epithet translates *ludi saeculares*, plays, shows, or games occurring once in 120 years, and bears interestingly on Milton's 'secular bird' (*S.A.*, 1707). In the same poem the claim that his admirer registers for Killigrew that he is able to 'please Critickes palates without Critickes too' needs clearing up: Cartwright here seems to be discriminating between critical judges and critical activities, critiques. Cartwright's language in these fine commendatory poems is particularly rich and loaded. In the second poem on Fletcher (line 18) the phrase 'over-births of wit' remains unglossed: *over-birth* seems to make no appearance in *O.E.D.*; does it mean 'multiple birth'? In the poem on Jonson there is a difficult passage (ll. 33 f.) which it is hard to make sense of in Professor Evans's text. The reading of *Works* must be adopted and the colon, which slipped out in *Jonsonus Virbius*, inserted at the end of line 34, thus making plain the contrast between the verb *discourse* (in its *O.E.D.* sense 2, 'to pass from premisses to conclusions') and *see*. At the end of this poem we need editorial help for the puzzling line where Jonson is hailed as 'Like curing *gold*, most valu'd now *th'art* lost'. Is Cartwright referring to some story of a lost *method* of treating diseases with gold, most valued, therefore, because the secret of it is no longer known? Perhaps the reader will encounter his severest difficulty in some lines in the poem to Duppera 'immediately after the Publick Act at Oxon. 1634' (p. 455). Describing the jollifications of the time, Cartwright says:

All Arts find welcome, all men come to do
Their Tricks and slights; Juglers, and *Curats* too,
Curats that threaten Markets with their Looks,
Arm'd with two weapons, Knives and Table-books;

Curat, in the sense that one would expect here—of some kind of fair-tide show-man—does not seem to be recorded. A remote possibility is *O.E.D.*, s.v. *cuirass* 2: *curats*, 'soldiers wearing cuirasses', although why these should be armed with knives and memoranda books is far from clear. But *curate* is also a Dublin term for 'barman' or 'waiter' (if I am not misreading a reference in an unlikely place—Joyce's *Ulysses*, 1937 ed., p. 161). Such difficulties should not be passed over by an editor without his confessing, at least, that he is baffled.

Although Professor Evans quotes generously from them, it is much to be regretted that he omitted the fifty-four commendatory poems which preface *Works*. They make up an almost unprecedented chorus of praise in which joined Lawes, Walton, Henry Vaughan, and James Howell (the last with remarkably

bad taste). This volume, already several times bulkier than its predecessor of 1651, would not have been greatly swollen by their inclusion, and they would have served, at the least, as a painfully interesting example of how wrong-headed coteries may be. Because of their omission, the work before us, from which Humphrey Moseley's dedication to the University of Oxford is also missing, lacks a certain flavour and encomiastic charm which are preserved in such things as Jasper Mayne's fine tribute to his friend or Thomas Vaughan's lines:

So fraught wert thou with Learning, that we can
Stile Thee almost a breathing *Vatican*. . . .

Cartwright's Latin poems are also lacking. It is not quite clear from Professor Evans's statements how much of the Latin verse survives, but the pieces listed in Appendix C should certainly have been printed. We are told (p. 50) that Cartwright's reputation in this kind outlived his fame as a writer of English verse.

It may safely be predicted that all his editor's care and devotion will not in the least alter Cartwright's status. He remains, as Bullen temperately remarked about Nabbes, 'at the feet of Shirley, somewhere on the lower slopes of Parnassus'. Professor Evans himself adopts a thoroughly cool and sensible attitude on the point. The poems and some of the songs in the plays are Cartwright's best things, 'a pointed Musick, sharpness without sting', as Mayne said: that disappointing composer Lawes, who revealingly confesses in his commendatory poem that he can hardly distinguish prose from verse, was given good material here. One may not agree with Professor Evans about the love poems which he selects (pp. 43-4) as 'almost perfect'; but there is a plenitude of movement in some of the occasional poems which shows up very well in what is perhaps Cartwright's finest single piece, 'To the memory of a Shipwreckt Virgin'. This should be in all the anthologies.

As for the plays, there are better 'platonic' than his—Davenant's are in every way more exemplary—while the Jonsonian *Ordinary* has Jonson's verbal energy without Jonson's organization. But to be able to read the plays in this edition does encourage speculation on the England of Wentworth and Laud, on the kind of society that could admire, almost defiantly, these brittle trifles. We perceive in them an anxiety about contemporary issues which worries away below the surface and manifests itself in fantastic wish-fulfilments. Like poor M. Bloch *père*, and despite his spider's-web ethic, Cartwright has an air 'négligent, fier et honteux', and his 'club' is exclusive and ridiculous: 'c'est un petit cercle, mais beaucoup plus agréable, le cercle des ganaches. On y juge sévèrement la galerie.' Cartwright's is a world where obstinate political problems disguise themselves as obsequious dreams, where the business of paying for an army (without a Parliament) is solved by melting down the furniture of boudoirs, where wars take place on comfortably distant frontiers and rebels turn out to be only pygmies (*The Royall Slave*). Compare the mock king Cratander in *The Royall Slave*—conspiracies against him dissolve away into a dream of concord—with that other mock king, Castruccio in *The Double Marriage*, and even Fletcher (or, more plausibly, Massinger) may appear politically sagacious by comparison with Cartwright. Here kings are lovers and lovers kings, and the sexes forget or inter-

change their roles: d'Urfé's *Astrée* and Charles I echo one another: 'il faut que mes commandemens soient des lois inviolables'. It is a dream of winter, sweet as spring. Dr. Mathew, indeed, has written of the spring-like quality of the Caroline age, its calm assurance of mood, and plainly this is what Cartwright would like to convey (as when he blandly celebrates the king's wholly disastrous visit to Scotland in 1633). Often he succeeds, despite the obvious anxiety, which to Mayne seemed prophetic. One wonders if the loyalties of an Arminian don sweetened the bitterness of his discovery that it was

time to leave the books in dust
And oil the unused armour's rust.

A member of the University's 'Council of War', ordered to put Oxford into a state of readiness for the reception of the royal troops, Cartwright died in November 1643—of the 'camp disease'. On that day King Charles, like King George at the death of another favoured royal artist, 'drop'd a tear into the Queen's Ear', and all his pictures, like Reynolds's, soon faded.

Professor Evans has produced a well-balanced edition. Its importance lies to a considerable degree in the fact that scarcely any other plays of this decade, with the exception of Jonson's *dotages*, have been so thoroughly exposed to scrutiny. Here at length we have a responsible edition of a representative 'Cavalier dramatist', and may better appreciate the species to which he belonged.

PETER URE

The Prologues and Epilogues of John Dryden. A Critical Edition. By WILLIAM BRADFORD GARDNER. Pp. xxii+361. New York: Columbia University Press, for the University of Texas; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1951. \$4.50; 30s. net.

On Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. By FRANK LIVINGSTONE HUNTLEY. Pp. x+71. (University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology 16.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1951. \$1.50.

In style and content, Dryden's prologues and epilogues make up one of the most varied and interesting categories of his poetry. They have a value, as vivid pictures of the Restoration theatrical scene, as social commentary, and as elegant compliment, vigorous satire, and verse criticism; and they merit consideration apart from the plays for which they were written. Dr. Gardner has gathered them, for the first time, into a single volume; and for this he deserves thanks.

It is, however, difficult to discover in what sense his edition is 'critical'. He has tried 'to reproduce what Dryden actually wrote', and describes his text as 'unadulterated Dryden, free from all editorial paraphernalia'. In the absence of manuscripts, it is impossible to reproduce 'what Dryden actually wrote'; and an editor does not arrive at even a reliable and satisfactory text merely by transcribing selected 'copy' and correcting a few typographical errors. Dr. Gardner has little notion of the complicated problems with which the modern editor of Dryden must confront himself, if he is to produce a critical text. His textual method

is too simple. He uses as a basis 'first editions published during Dryden's lifetime, except in the case of several poems which Dryden himself is known to have revised for subsequent editions'; but it is now generally recognized that a revised edition, apart from substantive corrections by the author, provides less authoritative copy-text than does a first edition. But even within the limits of his conservative method Dr. Gardner is not consistent. He uses the first edition of *The Kind Keeper* rather than the second, which Dryden probably over-saw, because the second 'contains very few and unimportant variants' (p. 240). Again, there is a lack of editorial integrity in his admission that, since the difference between the two issues of *The Tempest* (1670) 'appears' to be the correction of typographical errors, 'and since I do not have at hand a copy of the second issue, I have used the first issue as the basis for my text' (p. 202). Variant readings are significant in modern textual study, however few or apparently trivial they may be; and no edition can properly be described as 'critical' which is based on a naïve approach to textual work, and provides variant readings only when the editor thinks fit (e.g. pp. 204, 212, 215-17, 269-71, 274-6). An example of editorial irresponsibility of a different kind is Dr. Gardner's statement, in his notes on *The Rival Ladies*, that although a good case has been made¹ for identifying the long-lost epilogue to this play with an epilogue in a Bodleian manuscript, 'it has seemed well to omit it' from this edition 'since Dryden himself did not see fit to print the epilogue . . . and since it is extremely mediocre in quality' (p. 193).

Even more unfortunate is Dr. Gardner's conception of the duties of a commentator. His energy and labour in gathering material (dramatically set forth in his 'Acknowledgements') are not balanced by judgement. He flounders in an ocean of illustration and comment, sometimes illuminating, often irrelevant, and always verbose. He provides lengthy notes on the plays, with far more information on their critical background, plots, and stage history than is necessary for framing and dating the prologues and epilogues. On the other hand, his literary commentary is negligible. In these poems, as in every other category of his work, Dryden inherited and enriched a poetic tradition; and Dr. Gardner had a fine opportunity for setting the prologues and epilogues in an historical context, and for assessing their literary and dramatic value. But his introduction is a mere catalogue of themes, and his critical notes are few and insignificant.

Pepys is his fatal Cleopatra. The diarist throws much interesting and amusing light on the Restoration theatre; but his reactions to specific plays, and his play-house gossip, have little to do with the prologues and epilogues. Dr. Gardner is sometimes trivial: of all that he might have said on Nell Gwyn, in notes on the theatre, he contents himself with recalling that she was the King's mistress, and was remembered by him on his deathbed—'let not poor Nelly starve' (p. 207). Nor is Dr. Gardner's reasoning always clear: for example, in defending a reading 'Where' against the emendation to 'Were', he curiously notes that Milton 'pronounced the letter R very hard', suggests that Dryden may have pronounced 'were' in Milton's way, and there forsakes the problem (p. 213).

Dr. Huntley's monograph has four sections: an account of the critical back-

¹ Roswell G. Ham, 'Dryden's Epilogue to *The Rival Ladies*, 1664', *R.E.S.*, xiii (1937), 76-80.

ground to Dryden's *Essay*, an analysis of the argument, an analysis of the *Defence* of the *Essay*, and four pages entitled 'The Significance'. His first chapter is the most valuable part of the monograph. He emphasizes that the analytical chapters are much more than mere précis; but a rather fuller introduction, and some general comments on the drift of the *Essay*, would have made much of his detailed analysis unnecessary to an intelligent reader of Dryden's text. The final chapter is ludicrously thin; Dr. Huntley states only the obvious, and states it badly. Since his interest lies in the critical arguments of the *Essay*, a paragraph praising Dryden as a master of modern English prose could have been dispensed with in a four-page assessment of the *Essay*'s total significance; and the observation that early seventeenth-century prose was 'sententious to the point of being jejune, like that of Bacon, or a bit fulsome, like the prose of Browne or Milton', is an absurdly inadequate summary.

JAMES KINSLY

Joseph Spence, A Critical Biography. By AUSTIN WRIGHT. Pp. ix+265. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1951. 30s. net.

As Fulke Greville desired that on his tomb should be graven 'Friend to Sir Philip Sidney', so the majority of eighteenth-century students would be content to inscribe on Spence's his only true memorial, 'Friend to Alexander Pope'. It is doubtful whether even such a study as Professor Wright's will persuade them that anything could or should be added.

Since Singer's edition of the *Anecdotes* in 1820, with its brief but solid introduction, no one has attempted a full biography of Spence. Now Professor Wright, well qualified by years of study and armed with much manuscript material—uninvestigated since Singer's day and now mainly in the libraries of America—fills that gap and fills it as well as it can be filled. Despite all his material he has added very little to the framework of events which Singer presented. He merely adds detail and illustration, using more amply the letters and papers many of which Singer possessed but used only selectively. The same life appears, and the same personality, amiable, urbane, and unexciting; and it cannot be said that Professor Wright gives that figure any more vitality. There remains 'the amiable Mr. Spence', a polite scholar and charming gentleman—and little more.

Much of this book consists of a review of Spence's literary productions, now forgotten or overshadowed by the *Anecdotes*, but which accounted for his contemporary scholarly and literary reputation—the *Essay on Pope's Odyssey*, *Polymetis*, *Crito*, and some minor works. Through all this examination runs a note of despair at the hopelessness of trying to reinstate them. The *Essay on Pope's Odyssey*, which first earned him a reputation and the friendship of Pope, receives this final verdict: 'As literature [it] can lay no claim to distinction; but as painstaking, honest, and accurate criticism it deserves more consideration than seems ever likely to fall to its share.' Though claiming the importance of Spence's major scholarly work, *Polymetis*, in the history of eighteenth-century aesthetics,

he admits that 'The neglect which the book has suffered offers silent testimony that the world has considered it of little permanent value'. *Crito* 'has sunk (though hardly by its own weight) into obscurity', but Professor Wright pleads that, for its style and for its importance in early formulating Lessing's later dictum 'Reitz ist Schönheit in Bewegung', it should be reinstated in the minds of eighteenth-century students. The obscurity into which these works have fallen seems permanent, but, if they are never to be read again, Professor Wright's discussion of their content and significance must prove an admirable—and for many a perfectly sufficient—substitute.

The reader turns expectantly to the chapter on the *Anecdotes*, which is, however, disappointing. One expected more. The brief references to manuscripts made by Singer in his 1820 preface are here expanded, but not too clearly. A careful reading of the chapter and a separation of facts from the narrative setting furnishes a list of available Spence manuscripts, which has to be supplemented from the Notes at the end of the book, where the not inconsiderable manuscripts available in the British Museum are mentioned. A clear and systematic listing and describing of manuscripts would have formed a most desirable appendix to this book. Also disappointingly brief is the discussion of Spence's accuracy and reliability. Professor Wright mentions stylistic polishings, alterations of phrasing and order, but states that for the most part 'an anecdote remains unchanged in its progress from loose paper to the full transcripts'. The reader would have welcomed more examples from the ample material in the writer's hands, especially of those changed in transcript or mutilated in editing which Professor Wright discussed in greater detail in his article on this subject in *P.M.L.A.* lxii. Perhaps he considers, and possibly rightly, that the place for such detailed examination is not in a biography but in a critical edition of the *Anecdotes*. General approval will be given to his statement that a full edition from all available manuscript material, showing all changes from scribbled note to final anecdote, is a necessary and important contribution to literary scholarship. Students of the period look forward to such an edition, upon which Professor J. M. Osborn of Yale is at work, and to which this biography will be a worthy introduction.

GRAHAM MIDGLEY

James Thomson: Poet of 'The Seasons'. By DOUGLAS GRANT. Pp. vii+308. London: Cresset Press, 1951. 18s. net.

This work on Thomson must take high rank as a biography, if only because it contains a good deal of hitherto unpublished material, especially the correspondence with Miss Elizabeth Young, which gives us a clear view of Thomson's unlucky love affair. Moreover the book is well proportioned, there is plenty of detail, the figure of the poet stands out well from his surroundings, and we are given an adequate sense of his character. As general reading it can be recommended.

But, it must be confessed, it is not a contribution to scholarship. It is very well that Professor Grant should acknowledge a debt to Morel, since he uses his

material; but for any criticism of Thomson's poetry he refers us in his Preface to G. C. Macaulay's 'admirable analysis of Thomson's poetry', which surely at this date needs some revision; and as for the poet's philosophy, he finds it 'unnecessary to repeat the conclusions reached by Professor Alan Dugald McKillop in *The Background of Thomson's 'Seasons'*'. This is not so well, and for those of us who take more than a general reader's interest in Thomson it is disappointing, since Professor Grant is capable of commenting on these aspects, and so might have made the book more valuable for those whose main pursuit is literature as such. Still, a man has a right to produce the kind of book he wants to; so beyond expressing regret, this aspect is not the reviewer's affair.

There are one or two odd lapses in connexion with Thomson's contemporaries which might be corrected in a future edition. For instance on p. 88 we read that 'It is . . . very unlikely that Pope . . . could have been persuaded to write even the first lines of a prologue' (as though the prologue to *Cato* had no being); and on p. 140 we learn that Pope 'wrote an ambiguous prologue for' the performance of *The Provok'd Husband* when it was performed for Dennis's benefit. That is clearly a slip, and will not cause much harm. What, however, is dangerous, are Professor Grant's remarks on p. 100, where he develops into a page the statement that 'Thomson was the first modern poet to make Nature his theme'. He does indeed in the next paragraph concede that others 'had earlier and hesitantly attempted what he accomplished', and quotes Croxall's *Vision* for a solitary instance. However, on p. 100 we are told that 'Thomson's contemporaries, Alexander Pope, Ambrose Philips, and John Gay had happily used the countryside as a background for their pastorals. But earlier poets had made Nature subsidiary to humanity . . .' and so on, with a reminder that Ambrose Philips had introduced wolves into the English scene. It might be possible to argue that Thomson was the first poet to be completely 'picturesque', striving to imitate in words the canvases of Claude, Poussin, and Rosa; but even so this is to ignore Cooper's *Hill* and *Windsor Forest*, Cotton's *Winter*, an unduly neglected poem, and his time-of-day *Quatrains*. It is allowable to class Marvell's *Garden* as a nature poem, and it may be felt that to pass by Lady Winchilsea entirely, and make no mention of the other Philips's *Cyder*, is to show scant courtesy to those writers. All these did make nature their theme; and, of course, besides Croxall there were many lesser writers, such as Tickell and Diaper, who wrote sporadically or entirely about nature. Indeed no age has shown itself so devoted to nature, from the telescopic vision to the microscopic peering, and all in between, as the early eighteenth century. Professor Grant, it may be hazarded, is not quite sure of his background.

It might, however, be possible to make out a case for his point of view, if hedged about with due safeguards. What is a little surprising is Professor Grant's acceptance of every old cliché about the Patriots, as though he himself were the victim of their political propaganda. It is time this opposition view of Walpole's administration was drastically revised. As we know, of course, it is always the opposition that is patriotic, always the administration in power that plays party politics. How far Cobham and Lyttelton and the other out-of-power Whig grandees really believed their propaganda it is hard to say. They, and

Thomson, dubbed Walpole no patriot because he was, quite rightly as the event proved, opposed to war with Spain: the administration was probably far less corrupt than any previous one, if only because it was more publicly conducted, and no noticeable change occurred when the opposition came into power. But everything the administration did was suspect as 'corrupt'; Arbuthnot in a letter to Pope even cites the beneficent Excise Bill as evidence; and Professor Grant swallows all this whole. And this really is of some importance as regards Thomson. He was, of course, extremely patriotic—who would doubt it of the author of 'Rule Britannia'?—and with the chorus of out-of-office Whigs, was always ready to prate about liberty. It was the rage of the time. Thus an examination of the old assumptions about the age would have made Thomson's position, his grasp of what he was versifying about when he was not describing nature, a good deal more illuminating than an acceptance of them. This is not to say that we are not given a vivid picture of Thomson's social relations with the great, as well as with his fellow poets, such as Mallet and Shenstone; but these had not the influence on him in his later years that the grandes had.

One final query. Does Professor Grant really mean that Miss Young was an 'eminently practicable' young woman (p. 208)? She certainly did not prove so for Thomson.

BONAMY DOBRÉE

The Infinite Moment and Other Essays in Robert Browning. By WILLIAM O. RAYMOND. Pp. x+250. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1951. \$4.00; 30s. net.

In his introductory appreciation of Browning, Professor Raymond shows himself, both in outlook and in idiom, an inheritor of the Victorian critical tradition; and as such he praises Browning for his militant romanticism, his gusto, and his love of humanity. In those of the following essays which bear most directly upon the texts of particular poems, he takes these same qualities and their value on the whole for granted and concentrates, again like most of the earlier commentators, upon Browning's 'thought'. His contributions to the study of this will give his volume its chief interest to most of his readers.

In 'Browning and Higher Criticism', he shows how Browning safeguarded his religious faith in the face of biblical criticism by making, 'to an even greater degree than Tennyson . . . a distinction between love and reason, feeling and intelligence, which led him eventually to adopt a sceptical view of human knowledge'. Professor Raymond follows Sir Henry Jones in regarding this cleavage between love and reason as the basic error of Browning's philosophy. It is responsible, for example, for the curious ambiguity of some of his studies of sophistry. As Professor Raymond points out in 'Browning's Dark Mood: A Study of *Fifine at the Fair*' and in 'Browning's Casuists', the poet's distrust of reason makes it impossible for him rationally to refute the sophistry of Blougram, Don Juan, and the rest—or even completely to disengage himself from their arguments. Browning defeats them finally only by appealing, beyond reason, to love. The last of the four essays which are concerned largely with Browning's ideas is 'Browning's Conception of Love as Represented in *Paracelsus*'. Like

Herford and others, Professor Raymond sees an aspiration towards the ideal and a stooping to the real as Browning's two fundamental attitudes. In *Paracelsus* he traces, corresponding with these, two 'complementary' conceptions of love. In the second canto, love is a romantic 'principle of infinite aspiration'; in the fifth, it is an essentially Christian 'principle of self-surrender and a strength that stoops to weakness'.

In other essays Professor Raymond discusses various topics associated with the Brownings or their poems. He investigates the genesis of *The Ring and the Book*, describes an interesting manuscript account (unknown to Browning) of the murder-story used in that work, composes an attractive portrait of Isa Blagden, and convincingly defends Sir Edmund Gosse against the charge of being implicated in T. J. Wise's concoction of an alleged first edition of Mrs. Browning's *Sonnets from the Portuguese*. His last essay is a careful survey of the more important contributions to Browning studies made in English between 1910 and 1949.

With the exception of the concluding survey of Browning studies, all the essays in this volume have already been published in various American and Canadian scholarly journals. The findings recorded in the two papers on the genesis of *The Ring and the Book* have indeed gained general acceptance and have been incorporated in such standard works as W. C. DeVane's *A Browning Handbook*. Nevertheless, the University of Toronto Press has discharged a useful service to literary studies by making available in a convenient form these hitherto scattered papers of a respected Browning scholar.

J. D. JUMP

Formes du roman anglais de Dickens à Joyce. By IRÈNE SIMON. Pp. 464.

Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, 1949. 200 frs.

Mlle Simon uses as fundamental critical weapons in her formidable task several somewhat Crocean pronouncements of M. Louis Cazamian and a distinction drawn by Mr. Herbert Read. M. Cazamian insists that the critic's job is to divine 'the central intuition' of the work he is faced with and Mlle Simon defines form in the least narrow sense: 'La forme est l'esprit de l'œuvre, l'esprit exprimé ou réalisé dans la matière.' To this is added Mr. Read's distinction—from *Form in Modern Poetry*—between organic and abstract form. Organic form is the property of each particular successful work of art; it is only when 'an organic form is stabilized and repeated as a pattern' that it becomes abstract and can be considered apart from the particular context of the particular work.

Mlle Simon is not, in fact, really concerned with abstract form at all, and though she makes one or two rather half-hearted attempts to draw her material together at the end of her book, her method permits of the minimum of generalization. What her book amounts to is a collection of individual studies of eleven important English novelists. The word 'forms' might well have been left out of her title, for she is concerned neither with the technical problems of presentation nor with the tracing of any specifically formal development (if the expression means anything) in the English novel as a whole.

This is not an easy work to assess. On the one hand it has a kind of scrupulousness—a concern to read sympathetically and with each particular novel to get to the heart of the matter—which is rare and admirable. On the other there is a pervading flatness of judgement, too great a reliance on secondary sources, and an inadequate framework, historical and critical, for the task undertaken. Reflection leads one to wish to emphasize the credit side. There are not many good books on the English novel. One should be grateful for work which is, despite its bulk, unpretentious, generally sensitive, and always sincere. Above all one must welcome criticism of the novel which at least *starts* where it should, with an awareness and respect for the 'words on the page'.

As individual essays Mlle Simon's studies are almost always perceptive and are occasionally illuminated by the best kind of insight. On the middle section of *To the Lighthouse*, for instance: 'La deuxième partie, *Time Passes*, met en relief l'harmonie que créait Mrs Ramsay en lui opposant le désordre; en son absence, les éléments, faute de conscience unificatrice, retombent dans le chaos (comme la chambre de Jacob après sa mort).' But there are too many critical commonplaces which turn out, on examination, to be not quite true enough. On Thackeray: '... son esprit critique est impitoyable et soumet tout à l'analyse...'; 'Fielding accepte les choses et les êtres tels qu'ils sont'; 'La forme de Dickens, c'est la forme des êtres nombreux sortis de son cerveau.' Mlle Simon is at her best on the later novelists, especially on George Eliot, James, and Conrad (on whom she owes more than is implied to Dr. Leavis), on Lawrence (she is good on *The Plumed Serpent*), and on Virginia Woolf (again, with insufficient acknowledgement to Mr. Daiches).

A. C. KETTLE

Die englische Sprache: ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung. Erster Band. **Allgemeines: Lautgeschichte.** By KARL BRUNNER. Pp. xix+352. Halle: Niemeyer, 1950. RM. 12.

This comprehensive survey of the historical development of the English language, intended explicitly for university students, will comprise two substantial volumes. The first, now under review, is concerned with general history and phonology: the second, now at press, will deal mainly with inflexions; it will also contain a chapter on the use of English 'outside Europe'. The finished volumes will thus provide the advanced student with a new historical synthesis, the first of its kind and quality since the appearance of Karl Luick's monumental but incomplete *Historische Grammatik*, with which it may not unfittingly be compared. By setting himself narrower limits, Karl Brunner has managed to complete an exacting task to which he has brought deep learning as a scholar and long experience as a teacher. He has certainly spared no pains to incorporate into his book the more notable findings of recent research and he offers to guide the reader, paragraph by paragraph, to sources, articles, and even little-known dissertations, where the latest and most detailed information may be found.

In the first four chapters he discusses concisely the origin of the English nation,

the affinities of Old English with the other Germanic languages, the history and distribution of the dialects in relation to the rise of a standard literary language in the fifteenth century, and the precise forms of foreign influences upon the inherited vocabulary. He then devotes two long chapters to a well-marshalled display of the changes in vowel and consonant sounds, admirably summarizing and supplementing Luick's book which 'has lain constantly by his side'. Here, as elsewhere, he has 'limited himself to essentials, giving prior consideration to such features as are significant for the present-day language'. He has found room, in relevant sections, for a remarkably clear and succinct account of English orthography. Cautious, seldom and reluctantly dogmatic, he does not refrain from saying that a problem is insoluble when he finds it to be so. Professor Brunner is too good a scholar to assume that any history of English in this year of grace can be anything more than an interim report. Sometimes he deems it expedient to cite authorities, to compare their verdicts, and to point the way to further investigation. He is careful to make it clear when he is proffering a possible and reasonable explanation and when he is propounding a generally accepted conclusion based upon incontrovertible evidence. His more general observations are well presented: they show a sound sense of proportion. He points out, for example, that the organization of Anglo-Saxon England into dioceses by Theodore of Tarsus in the seventh century has an unusual significance for the historian of language because that organization, founded on racial and linguistic divisions, was destined to outlast both the Great Invasion and the Norman Conquest and in general to be preserved until after the Reformation. Owing to lack of other evidence and dearth of uncontaminated texts, these ecclesiastical boundaries are extraordinarily important (p. 38). Isoglosses were constantly shifting within the Middle English period and extant documents are inadequate to justify us in fixing rigid limits. We should likewise abstain from deducing too much about medieval conditions from our study of present-day dialects and place-names (p. 88). The King James Bible of 1611 was authorized for use not only in the Church of England but in the Scottish Church also, and this meant that the voluminous theological polemics of seventeenth-century Scotland were couched in impeccable Standard English (p. 101). Dialect speech has been recorded in abundance since the middle of the eighteenth century, but the queer spellings adopted by writers of regional novels and short stories should be regarded as only rough approximations. They are intended for the general reader and, with rare exceptions, they are far too amateurish and too capricious to be used as linguistic evidence (p. 109). Even advanced students may need to be reminded that names have generally been given to places by the neighbours and not by the inhabitants (p. 126). Teachers of School Latin who adhered to its conventional accentuation had no small influence upon the pronunciation of Romance borrowings in Middle and early Modern English (p. 238 *et passim*). English consonant sounds are unexpectedly archaic. On the whole they have changed less than those in any of the other more nearly related European languages (p. 303).

One or two small points may be noted. Instead of equating Lat. *porcus* with OE. and OHG. *furh*, G. *Furche*, and NE. *furrow* (p. 58), it would be more

appropriate to compare it with OE. *fearh*, OHG. *farh*, G. *Ferkel* and NE. *farrow*, even though it may be conceded that Lat. *porcus* 'swine' and *porca* 'balk, ridge between furrows' derive ultimately from a common etymon. The Old Norse runic inscription, commemorating founder and builder, can no longer be seen over the entrance of Pennington Church (p. 131) for the ancient building was demolished early in the nineteenth century to make room for a more spacious structure. This famous inscribed tympanum may now be found built into the wall of an outbuilding at Beckside Farm in the same North Lancashire parish. Wulfstan of Worcester was not 'the only bishop of English descent' (p. 145) who lived to see the year 1087, for that privilege was also shared by Giso of Wells. Anglo-Norman (*e*)*streit* has given Modern English *strait*, not *straight* (p. 152). The grouping together of *adventure*, *avantage*, and *advice*, which supplanted earlier *aventure*, *avantage*, and *avis* respectively 'by substitution of the Latin prefix *ad-* for the French *a-*' (p. 187), may mislead the less wary reader. Latinizing reformers were right in assuming etymological *ad-* in *adventure*, from *adventura* (*res*) and in *advice*, from late *ad+visum*, but they were not justified in assuming it for *avantage*, from *avant* (*ab+ante*)+*age*. A careful speaker may still discriminate (p. 269) between Germanic *salve* [sa:v] in 'salving an uneasy conscience' and Romance *salve* [sælv] in 'salving a shattered reputation'.

It is unfortunate that this volume is disfigured by so many misprints, only a few of which are rectified in the list of *Nachträge und Berichtigungen* on p. 352. A full list would cover several pages. Uncorrected perversions of proper names are especially disturbing. After a time the reader loses confidence in the text before him, suspecting every unfamiliar form to be a distortion. He finds 'Waldstein' for 'Wadstein' (p. 6, l. 38); 'Comulodunum' for 'Camulodunum' (p. 8, l. 40); 'Lindsay' for 'Lindsey' (p. 22, l. 5); 'Sherbourne' for 'Sherborne' (map, p. 39); 'Carmathen' for 'Carmarthen' (p. 50, l. 18); 'Fyne Moryson' for 'Fynes Moryson' (p. 99, l. 19); 'Burnt' for 'Burns' (p. 109, l. 9); 'Montgomery' for 'Montgomery' (p. 162, l. 1); 'Themes' for 'Thames' (p. 258, l. 22); and many more. Max Niemeyer Verlag, once so renowned for technical efficiency, is clearly working under difficulties.

Apart from these typographical blemishes, this book is a superior achievement in every way and its readers will anticipate with pleasure the appearance of the second part which will include summaries of contents and a complete index.

SIMEON POTTER

farrow,
ridge
Norse
seen
ng was
acious
to the
parish.
) who
Wells.
152).
anted
Latin
tiniz-
dven-
ed in
may
easym

few
full
are
fore
tein'
40);
39);
son'
ery'
Max
ing
ent
the

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

EDINBURGH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY TRANSACTIONS

Vol. iii, Part 1 (Session 1948-9)

Fragments of 'The Palyce of Honour' of Gawin Douglas printed by Thomas Davidson at Edinburgh c. 1540 (William Beattie), pp. 31-46.

Two notes on fifteenth-century printing (William Beattie), pp. 75-77.

ELH

Vol. xix, No. 2, June 1952

The façade of morality (J. W. Saunders), pp. 81-114.

[In Spenser.]

'Eterne in mutabilitie': the unified world of *The Faerie Queene* (Kathleen Williams), pp. 115-30. Spenser and Ireland (Raymond Jenkins), pp. 131-42.

The truancy of Calidore (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 143-9.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxiii, No. 3, June 1952

The authorship of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (M. Mincoff), pp. 97-115. Phonetic aspects of the spoken pun (J. D. O'Connor), pp. 116-24.

Vol. xxxiii, No. 4, August 1952

Chaucer and the Inns of Court (D. S. Bland), pp. 145-55.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

V^e Année, No. 1, Février 1952

A critique of Jespersen's Modern English Grammar (R. W. Zandvoort), pp. 2-10.

Skelton et le Yorkshire (Maurice Pollet), pp. 11-16.

Samuel Butler à l'école du Roi (René Lamar), pp. 17-24.

LEEDS STUDIES IN ENGLISH AND KINDRED LANGUAGES

Numbers Seven and Eight, 1952

Two notes on *Beowulf* (A. R. Taylor), pp. 5-17.

Some literary influences in the *Revelations of Julian of Norwich* (Anna Maria Reynolds), pp. 18-28. Two manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience* in the Brotherton Collection, University of Leeds (K. W. Humphreys and J. Lightbown), pp. 29-38.

The vocabulary of *The Metrical Life of St Robert of Knaresborough* (Joyce Bazire), pp. 39-44.

The Sykes manuscript of the York Scriveners' Play (A. C. Cawley), pp. 45-80.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxvii, No. 4, April 1952

Of locks and keys—line 19^a of the O.E. *Christ* (Stanley B. Greenfield), pp. 238-40.

Sir Gawain and Ralph Holmes the Green Knight (Haldean Braddy), pp. 240-2.

'Mwatide', *Beowulf* 2226 (Elliott V. K. Dobbie), pp. 242-5.

Chaucer, Venus, and the 'seventh spere' (Jackson I. Cope), pp. 245-6. The relation of Germanic folk custom and ritual to Ealuscerwen (*Beowulf* 769) (Henry Winfred Splitter), pp. 255-8.

Vol. lxvii, No. 5, May 1952

Caxton's life of S. Rocke (Sister Mary Jeremy), pp. 313-17.

A rare use of numerals in Chaucer (W. P. Lehmann), pp. 317-21.

Gnaphaeus in England (A. Bronson Feldman), pp. 325-8.

The Miller's Tale: 3187-3215: Chaucer and the seven liberal arts in burlesque vein (George R. Coffman), pp. 329-31.
Hichecok's 'This Worlde is but a Vanyte' (HM 183) (R. H. Bowers), pp. 331-3.
One Robyn or two (Charles A. Owen, Jr.), pp. 336-8.
 [Chaucer's Miller.]

Life is a pilgrimage in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* 2847-49 (Johnstone Parr), pp. 340-1.

Vol. lxvii, No. 6, June 1952

The OE. Bede: Book III, chapters 16 to 20 (J. J. Campbell), pp. 381-6.

The Aspern Papers: Great-aunt Wyckoff and Juliana Bordereau (Leon Edel), pp. 392-5.

The sources of the OE. *Kentish Hymn* (Geoffrey Shepherd), pp. 395-7.

Wanderer, lines 50-57 (D. S. Brewer), pp. 398-9.

Chaucer's Madame Eglantine (R. T. Davies), pp. 400-2.

Yeats' golden tree and birds in the Byzantium poems (Thomas L. Dume), pp. 404-7.

Matthew Arnold's pronunciation of the name Iseult (Lyman A. Cotten), pp. 407-9.

A forgotten war poem by D. H. Lawrence (Ernest W. Tedlock, Jr.), pp. 410-13.

A grain of truth about Wordsworth and Browning, Landor and Swinburne (R. H. Super), pp. 419-21.

A note on Cooper and *Robinson Crusoe* (W. B. Gates), pp. 421-2.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. xlvii, No. 3, July 1952

Boswell and Rousseau (R. A. Leigh), pp. 289-318.

Sectional divisions of poems in Old English manuscripts (B. J. Timmer), pp. 319-22.

A shorter metrical version of 'The Gast of Gy' (J. Lightbown), pp. 323-9.

Three unrecorded OE. personal names of a late type (P. H. Reaney), p. 374.

A Middle-English poem on lovedays (R. H. Bowers), pp. 374-5.

'King Lear'—the 1608 quarto (Alice Walker), pp. 376-8.

NEOPHILOLOGUS
 36ste Jaarg., Afl. 2, 1 April 1952

The foundation of the Bodleian Library and XVIIth century Holland (A. G. H. Bachrach), pp. 101-14.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN
 Vol. liii, Nos. 1-4, 1952

Notes on the use of the ingressive auxiliary in the works of William Shakespeare (Y. M. Biese), pp. 9-18. Notes on Richardson's language (Erik Erämetsä), pp. 18-20.

On the date of Ben Jonson's *A Tale of a Tub* (Esko Pennanen), pp. 224-40.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. cxvii, No. 10, 10 May 1952

Jasper Heywood and Marlowe's 'Doctor Faustus' (T. M. Pearce), pp. 200-1.

'Sooth' in Johnson's 'Dictionary' and in Keats (D. J. Greene), pp. 204-5.

[See *N. & Q.* cxvii. 405-7.]

The text of 'The Vanity of Human Wishes' (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 205-6. Stylistic echoes in Hazlitt (Stewart C. Wilcox), pp. 211-12.

Vol. cxvii, No. 11, 24 May 1952

Gower's serpent and the carbuncle (Marie Neville), pp. 225-6.

Christmas revels at the Inns of Court (R. J. Schoeck), pp. 226-9.

The Masque of the Twelve Months (Ralph C. Elsey), pp. 229-32.

[See *N. & Q.* cxvii. 150.]

Daniel Defoe's 'Abdy, Harvy' in 'A New Discovery of an Old Intrigue' (Spiro Peterson), pp. 232-4.
 Joseph Glanvil and 'The Character of a Coffee-House' (Samuel A. Weiss), pp. 234-5.
 Swift's renunciation of the Muse (Maurice Johnson), pp. 235-6.
 A note on Addison's upholsterer (William H. Wiatt), p. 236.
 The date of composition of Wordsworth's 'Thanksgiving Ode' (B. Bernard Cohen), pp. 236-7.

Vol. cxcvii, No. 12, 7 June 1952

Sir Thomas Wyatt and 'Sephame' (William H. Wiatt), p. 244.
 Shakespeare and Peele: the death of Cleopatra (Irving Ribner), pp. 244-6.
 The power of chastity in 'Paradise Lost' (G. D. Hildebrand), p. 246.
 Dr. Johnson and some physico-theological terms (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 249-53.

[See *N. & Q. cxcvii. 162-5.*]

The prince of connoisseurs. Horace Walpole and Strawberry Hill (Michael Barrington), pp. 253-8.

Vol. cxcvii, No. 13, 21 June 1952

The Flemings in Shakespeare's theatre (A. Bronson Feldman), pp. 265-9.
 Comparative popularity of early fiction and drama (Charles C. Mish), pp. 269-70.

The play performed at the Globe on 7 February, 1601 (C. A. Greer), pp. 270-1.

Split lines in the First Folio (Kenneth Muir), pp. 271-2.

Shakespeare's influences in Beaumont and Fletcher (Murray Abend), pp. 272-4.

[Continued *cxcvii. 360-3.*]

Dr. Johnson quotes one of his amanuenses (Arthur Sherbo), p. 276.
 The translations of mottoes and quotations in Johnson's 'Rambler' (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 278-9.

Vol. cxcvii, No. 14, 5 July 1952
 Pure poetry in 1762 (R. H. Bowers), p. 294.

[Whitehead's *A Charge to the Poets.*]
 The Wordsworths and botany (D. E. Coombe), pp. 298-9.
 Keats, Coleridge and negative capability (Barbara Hardy), pp. 299-301.
 Keats and compound epithets (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 301-4, 306.

[See *N. & Q. cxcvii. 186-9.*]

Vol. cxcvii, No. 15, 19 July 1952

Donne's birthdate (I. A. Shapiro), pp. 310-13.
 The blinding of Gloucester (Alan Price), pp. 313-14.
 Milton's 'Upon the Circumcision' and Tasso (Ants Oras), pp. 314-15.
 Milton's 'Paradise Lost', III, 481-3 (Geoffrey Carnall), pp. 315-16.
 A probable antecedent of Marvell's Horatian Ode (William Simeone), pp. 316-18.

Pope's reputation as a Deist (Robert Donald Spector), p. 318.

More Hazlitt allusions (D. S. Bland), p. 319.

Peter Pindar 'Redivivus' (P. M. Zall), pp. 319-22.

The MS. of the 'Cricket on the Hearth' (K. J. Fielding), pp. 324-5, 329.

Vol. cxcvii, No. 16, 2 August 1952

The identity of E. K. of the Shepheardes Calender (C. Margaret Greig), pp. 332-4.
 'Hero and Leander' and 'Love's Labour's Lost' (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 334-5.
 Folio sophistications in 'Othello' (Kenneth Muir), pp. 335-6.

Vol. cxcvii, No. 17, 16 August 1952

Dutch Humanism and the Tudor dramatic tradition (A. Bronson Feldman), pp. 357-60.

'The Rape of the Lock', III, 155-8 (Arthur Pollard), pp. 363-4.

Inns of Court nomenclature: corrections for 'O.E.D.' (D. S. Bland), p. 364.

G. M. Hopkins and Provost Fortescue (F. H. Amphlett Micklewright), pp. 365-6.

[See *N. & Q.* cxcvii. 169-72.]

Vol. cxcvii, No. 18, 30 August 1952

'Every Man out of his Humour' and Shakespeare's 'Sonnets' (Thomas H. McNeal), p. 376.

The Columbia Milton: fifth supplement (J. Milton French, Maurice Kelley, and Thomas O. Mabbott), pp. 376-9.

Tityos and Satan (D. T. Starnes), pp. 379-80.

[In *Paradise Lost*.]

Sir Thomas Browne's reading on the Turks (Berna Moran), pp. 380-2.

John Locke and John Aubrey (Maurice Cranston), pp. 383-4.

Calverley and Jean Ingelow (Hilda D. King), pp. 385-7.

Links with Shakespeare (H. A. Shield), pp. 387-9.

[See *N. & Q.* cxcvii. 156-7.]

Dryden's paraphrase of Horace and 'The Staple of News' (J. C. Maxwell), p. 389.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxi, No. 1, January 1952

Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke (Alfred Owen Aldridge), pp. 1-16.

Benjamin Disraeli's letters to Robert Carter (Hubert H. Hoeltje), pp. 17-26.

Whitman, Shakespeare, and the Baconians (Floyd Stovall), pp. 27-38.

Considerations upon Corrupt Elections of Members to Serve in Parliament, 1701: by Anthony Hammond, not Defoe (Ian Watt), pp. 45-53.

The parting scene in Jonson's *Poetaster* (IV, ix) (Ralph Nash), pp. 54-62.

Chatterton's suicide (Donald S. Taylor), pp. 63-69.

Three new poems by Davenant (Herbert Berry), pp. 70-74.

Henley's share in Beckford's *Vathek* (Karl F. Thompson), pp. 75-80.

'Punch's Apotheosis' (Paul O. Clark), pp. 81-85.

[In *Rejected Addresses*.]

Coleridge's comment on the moral of 'The Ancient Mariner' (Thomas M. Raylor), pp. 88-91.

Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary*: a preliminary puff (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 91-93.

Harvey, Nashe, and the three *Par-nassus* plays (Travis L. Summers-gill), pp. 94-95.

Campion and Propertius (J. V. Cunningham), p. 96.

Vol. xxxi, No. 2, April 1952

The Romantic Movement: a selective and critical bibliography (J. Raymond Derby and others), pp. 97-155.

The 'improvised lay' in *Beowulf* (Norman E. Eliason), pp. 171-9.

The structural use of a traditional theme in *Troilus and Cressida* (Robert K. Presson), pp. 180-8.

Othello, Iago, and Cassio as soldiers (John Robert Moore), pp. 189-94.

Matthew Arnold's sea of life (W. Stacy Johnson), pp. 195-207.

A 'source' for the rope-dancing in *Gulliver's Travels* (Edward W. Rosenheim, Jr.), pp. 208-11.

Advice Resented: a Middle-English Court of Love poem (R. H. Bowers), pp. 211-14.

Will Summers: an unrecorded jest-book (Charles C. Mish), pp. 215-18.

Milton's *Moscovia* not history (George B. Parks), pp. 218-21. (Reply by Joseph Allen Bryant, Jr., pp. 221-3.)

Sources of the subplot of Marston's *The Dutch Courtezan* (James L. Jackson), pp. 223-4.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxvii, No. 4, June 1952

Ruskin and Hobson (John Tyree Fain), pp. 297-307.

Molinos: 'The subject of the day' in *The Ring and the Book* (William Coyle), pp. 308-14.

Dickens on American slavery: a Carlylean slant (Arthur A. Adrian), pp. 315-29.

George Ripley and Thomas Carlyle (Joseph Slater), pp. 341-9.

Charles Lamb's insight into the nature of the novel (Charles I. Patterson), pp. 375-82.

Negative capability and wise passiveness (Jacob D. Wigod), pp. 383-90.

[Keats and Wordsworth.]

The contributions of John Nichols to Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (Edward Hart), pp. 391-410.

Pope's social satire: belles-lettres and business (Hugo M. Reichard), pp. 420-34.

Science and structure in Milton's *Doctrine of Divorce* (Kester Svendsen), pp. 435-45.Herry Lovelich's *Merlin* (Robert W. Ackerman), pp. 473-84.

The Athelstan gift story: its influence on English chronicles and Carolingian romances (Laura Hibbard Loomis), pp. 521-37.

The Old English nominal compounds in *-rād* (Caroline Brady), pp. 538-71.

Tennyson's 'Tithon', 'Tears, idle tears', and 'Tithonus' (Frederick L. Gwynn), pp. 572-5.

The making of *Ramblers* 186 and 187 (Arthur Sherbo), pp. 575-80.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. xl ix, No. 2, April 1952

The teaching of English in Tudor grammar schools (William Nelson), pp. 119-43.

The Italian pedagogy of Claudio Hollyband (R. C. Simonini, Jr.), pp. 144-54.

The Ciceronianism of Gabriel Harvey (P. Albert Duhamel), pp. 155-70.

The political problem in Shakespeare's Lancastrian tetralogy (Irving Ribner), pp. 171-84.

Cloten with Caius Lucius (Warren D. Smith), pp. 185-94.

[In *Cymbeline*.]

The significance of Ben Jonson's first requirement for tragedy: 'truth of argument' (Joseph Allen Bryant, Jr.), pp. 195-213.

Drayton and the Countess of Bedford (Dick Taylor, Jr.), pp. 214-28.

Christopher Harvey's *The Synagogue* (1640) (A. C. Howell), pp. 229-47. Recent literature of the Renaissance (Ernest William Talbert and others), pp. 251-436.*Vol. xl ix, No. 3, July 1952*Swift's use of the *Philosophical Transactions* in Section V of *A Tale of a Tub* (R. C. Olson), pp. 459-67. Lord Byron's fiery convert of revenge (Carl Lefevre), pp. 468-87.

Shelley and Milton (Frederick L. Jones), pp. 488-519.

New documents in Browning's Roman murder case (Beatrice Corrigan), pp. 520-33.

"That two-handed engine" and Savonarola: supplement (Edward S. LeComte), pp. 548-50.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

January—June 1952

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1952 the date of each publication.]

ABERCROMBIE, L. *The Art of Wordsworth*. pp. viii+157. 10s. 6d.

ARNAVON, C. *Les Lettres américaines devant la critique française (1887-1917)*. Paris, 1951. pp. 153. No price given.

BEATTY, R. C. and others. *Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities*, vol. i. Nashville, 1951. pp. viii+275. \$3.50.

BERKMAN, SYLVIA. *Katherine Mansfield*. pp. viii+246. 21s.

BICKERSTETH, G. L. *Dante's Virgil*. Glasgow. pp. 41. 4s. 6d.

BOND, R. P. *Queen Anne's American Kings*. Oxford. pp. xii+148. 21s.

BOWERS, F. (ed.). *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. iv. Charlottesville, 1951. pp. 237. \$6.00.

BRITISH ACADEMY. *Proceedings*, vol. xxxiv, 1948. n.d. pp. xii+291. 40s.

BROWN, B. D., E. K. HENINGHAM, and F. L. UTLEY. *Ninth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400*. New Haven. pp. 1765-1938. \$4.00.

BRUNIUS, T. *David Hume on Criticism*. Stockholm. pp. 137. Sw. Kr. 24.

BUCKLEY, J. H. *The Victorian Temper*. Cambridge, Mass. pp. xiv+282. 30s.

CLEMOES, P. *Liturgical Influence on Punctuation in Late Old English and Early Middle English Manuscripts*. Cambridge. pp. 24. 2s. 6d.

COLLEDGE, E. (trans.). *Blessed Jan van Ruysbroek. The Spiritual Espousals*. pp. 195. 18s.

CRAIGIE, Sir W. A. *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue. Part XIV, H-Hew*. pp. 1-120. 15s.

CUNNINGHAM, J. V. *Woe or Wonder*. Denver, 1951. pp. viii+9-136. \$2.50.

DAICHES, D. *Robert Burns*. pp. viii+376. 15s.

DIAPER, W. *The Complete Works*, ed. Dorothy Broughton. pp. lxxviii+363. 15s.

DICKINS, B. *The Genealogical Preface to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Cambridge. pp. 8. 1s.

DIETH, E. and H. ORTON. *A Questionnaire for a Linguistic Atlas of England*. Leeds. pp. ii+607-700. 12s. 6d.

DONNE, J. *Essays in Divinity*, ed. E. M. Simpson. Oxford. pp. xxxi+137. 15s.

DONNER, H. W. *Två Kapitel Engelsk Grammatik*. Helsingfors, 1951. pp. 108. No price given.

DOUGLAS, M. W. *Lord Oxford and the Shakespeare Group* [3rd edn.]. Oxford. pp. 168. 8s. 6d.

DOWNER, A. S. (ed.). *English Institute Essays 1950*. New York, 1951. pp. 236. 20s.

DUCKETT, ELEANOR S. *Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne*. New York, 1951. pp. xii+337. 30s.

ENGLISH ASSOCIATION. *Essays and Studies 1951*. Collected by Geoffrey Tillotson. 1951. pp. iv+149. 10s. 6d.

FISCHER, W. *Deutscher Kultureinfluss am viktorianischen Hofe bis zur Gründung des Deutschen Reiches (1870)*. Gießen, 1951. pp. 74. DM. 4.

FISCHER, W. and K. WENTERSDORF. *Shakespeare-Studien*. Marburg, 1951. pp. 208. DM. 12.

FOGLE, F. R. *A Critical Study of William Drummond of Hawthornden*. New York. pp. xviii+236. 21s.

FRICKER, R. *Kontrast und Polarität in den Charakterbildern Shakespeares*. Berne, 1951. pp. 275. Sw. fr. 14.00.

GAUGER, H. *Die Kunst der politischen Rede in England*. Tübingen. pp. viii+259. DM. 19.40.

GRANT, W. and D. D. MURISON (edd.). *The Scottish National Dictionary*, vol. iii, Part IV. Edinburgh. pp. 143-261+xxii.

GREG, W. W. (ed.). *Jonson's Masque of Gipsies*. pp. x+235. 25s.

GUNN, A. M. F. *The Mirror of Love* [2nd printing]. Lubbock, Tx. pp. xvi+592. \$5.25.

GURNEY, P. *On the Study and Discipline of Literature*. pp. 17. 2s. 6d.

HAMMER, C., Jr. (ed.). *Goethe after Two Centuries*. Baton Rouge. pp. xii+118. \$2.50.

HANSON, L. and E. Marian Evans & George Eliot. pp. xiv+402. 25s.

HARMER, F. E. *Anglo-Saxon Writs*. Manchester. pp. xxii+604. 56s.

HAY, D. *Polydore Vergil*. Oxford. pp. xiv+223. 25s.

HEWITT, D. Conrad. *A Reassessment*. Cambridge. pp. viii+141. 10s. 6d.

HOLMES, U. T., Jr. *Daily Living in the*

Twelfth Century. Madison, Wis. pp. xiv+337. \$3.85.

HOPKINS, A. B. Elizabeth Gaskell. pp. xii+13-383. 21s.

HOTSON, L. Shakespeare Motley. pp. x+133. 21s.

KETTLE, A. An Introduction to the English Novel. I. pp. 200. 8s. 6d.

KIRK, R. (ed.). The Moral Philosophie of the Stoicks. New Brunswick, N.J., 1951. pp. x+134. \$3.50.

MALONE, K. (ed.). The Thorkelin Transcripts of Beowulf in Facsimile. Copenhagen. pp. 32+plates. £15. 15s.

MALONE SOCIETY. Bonduca by John Fletcher. Oxford, 1951. pp. xvi+112. — Wit and Science by John Redford. Oxford, 1951. pp. xii+58.

MUELLER, W. R. The Anatomy of Robert Burton's England. Berkeley and Los Angeles. pp. x+121. \$2.00.

NICOLL, A. (ed.). Shakespeare Survey V. Cambridge. pp. viii+162. 15s.

OWST, G. R. The Destructorium Viciorum of Alexander Carpenter. pp. iv+40. 5s.

PAYNE, W. L. (ed.). The Best of Defoe's Review. An Anthology. New York, 1951. pp. xxvi+289. 25s.

PRAZ, M. (ed.). English Miscellany, vol. iv. Rome, 1951. pp. viii+285. 9s.

RAY, G. N., C. J. WEBER, and J. CARTER. Nineteenth-Century English Books. Urbana, Ill. pp. xiv+88. \$3.00.

READ, H. English Prose Style [new edn.]. pp. xvi+216. 12s. 6d.

RICHARDSON, W. C. Tudor Chamber Administration 1485-1547. Baton Rouge. pp. xvi+541. \$6.53.

ROBBINS, R. H. (ed.). Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries. Oxford. pp. lviii+331. 18s.

ROBERTSON, D. W., Jr., and B. F. HUPPÉ. Piero Plowman and Scriptural Tradition. Princeton, 1951. pp. xiv+259. 25s.

ROBERTSON, JEAN (ed.). Poems by Nicholas Breton. Liverpool. pp. clx+229. 30s.

RYNELL, A. Parataxis and Hypotaxis as a Criterion of Syntax and Style especially in Old English Poetry. Lund. pp. 60. Sw. Kr. 6.00.

SANN, A. Bunyan in Deutschland. Gießen, 1951. pp. 142. DM. 6.

SCHIRMER, W. F. John Lydgate. Tübingen. pp. xii+225. DM. 27.

SCHMIDT, K. Die Bühnenprobe als Lustspieltyp in der englischen Literatur. Halle. pp. 32. DM. 1.00.

SCHULZE, F. W. (ed.). W. Wordsworth/ S. T. Coleridge Lyrical Ballads (1798). Halle. pp. x+200. DM. 9.80.

SEHRT, E. T. Vergebung und Gnade bei Shakespeare. Stuttgart. pp. 260. DM. 18.00.

SHAKESPEARE, W. Henry VI: Parts I, II, and III, ed. J. D. Wilson. Cambridge. pp. lvi+222; liv+221; xlvi+225. 12s. 6d. each.

— Tout est bien qui finit bien. Traduction de C. Cambillard. Paris. pp. xxvi+232. No price given.

— Select Catalogue of Books in Newcastle upon Tyne City Libraries. Newcastle. pp. 36.

SHINE, H. (ed.). Carlyle's Unfinished History of German Literature. Lexington, 1951. pp. xxxvi+156. \$3.00.

SOCIETY FOR THEATRE RESEARCH. Studies in English Theatre History. pp. viii+135. No price given.

SOUTHERN, R. Changeable Scenery. pp. 411. 63s.

STAFFORD, J. The Literary Criticism of 'Young America'. Berkeley. pp. viii+154. \$2.00.

STEELE, SIR R. The Occasional Verses, ed. R. Blanchard. Oxford. pp. xxiv+137. 21s.

SWIFT, J. Political Tracts 1711-1713, ed. H. Davis. Oxford, 1951. pp. xxviii+220. 21s.

TAYLOR, F. Hand-List of Additions to the Collection of English Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library. Manchester, 1951. pp. 50. 2s. 6d.

THOMSON, J. A. K. Shakespeare and the Classics. pp. 254. 18s.

TREVELYAN, G. M. English Literature and Its Readers. pp. 7. 3s. 6d.

WALCUTT, C. C. The Romantic Compromise in the Novels of Winston Churchill. Ann Arbor, 1951. pp. vi+53. \$1.25.

WERBLOWSKY, R. J. Z. Lucifer and Prometheus. pp. xx+120. 16s.

WILSON, R. M. The Lost Literature of Medieval England. pp. xiv+272. 15s.

WITTKOWER, R. The Artist and the Liberal Arts. pp. 20. 4s.

INDEX

Adams, H. H., and Hathaway, B., edd., *Dramatic Essays of the Neo-Classical Age*, revd., 294.
 Ælfric. See Raith, Josef.
 Aeschylus. See Maxwell, J. C.
 Arnold, Matthew. See Tillotson, Kathleen.
 Austen, Jane, *Volume the Third*, revd., 183.
 Bacon, Francis. See Gibson, R. W.
 Banks, T. H., *Milton's Imagery*, revd., 390.
 Bateson, F. W., *English Poetry: A Critical Introduction*, revd., 87. See also Pope, Alexander.
 Bennett, C. H., art. by, The Text of Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Hannah More, 341.
Beowulf. See Gang, T. M. (art.); Bonjour, Adrien, Whitelock, Dorothy (revd.).
 Bland, D. S., note by, Interludes in Fifteenth-Century Revels at Furnivall's Inn, 263.
 Boas, F. S., *Thomas Heywood*, revd., 285.
 Bonjour, Adrien, *The Digressions in Beowulf*, revd., 165.
 Bowers, F., note by, Essex's Rebellion and Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, 365; *Principles of Bibliographical Description*, revd., 296.
 Brewer, D. S., note by, Brutus' Crime: A Footnote to *Julius Caesar*, 51.
 Britain, R. See Smart, Christopher.
 Brooks, Cleanth. See Percy, Thomas.
 Browne, William. See Grundy, Joan.
 Browning, Robert. See Raymond, W. O.
 Brunner, Karl, *Die englische Sprache: ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung*. Erster Bd. *Allgemeines: Lautgeschichte*, revd., 404.
 Bühler, C. F., McManaway, J. G., and Wroth, L. C., *Standards of Bibliographical Description*, revd., 296.
 Callan, N. See Smart, Christopher.
 Carlyle, Thomas: *The Letters of T. C. to William Graham*, ed. J. Graham, Jun., revd., 83.
 Cartwright, William: *The Plays and Poems of W. C.*, ed. G. B. Evans, revd., 392.
 Chaucer, Geoffrey. See Lawrence, W. W., Speirs, J.
 Clifford, J. L., *Johnsonian Studies 1887-1950: A Survey and Bibliography*, noticed, 299.
 Davenport, A., note by, W. B. Yeats and the Upanishads, 55. See also Hall, Joseph.
 David, R., ed. *Love's Labour's Lost*, revd., 380.
 Davies, Sir John. See Simpson, P.
 Davis, H. See Swift, Jonathan.
 Davis, N., art. by, A Paston Hand, 209.
 Day, John, *Law Tricks* (Malone Society Reprint), revd., 389.
 De Beer, G. R. See Pennant, Thomas.
 De Quincey, Thomas, *Recollections of the Lake Poets*, ed. E. Sackville-West, noticed, 299.
 Defoe, Daniel. See Watt, I.
 Dekker, Thomas. See Bowers, F.
 Dennis, Leah. See Percy, Thomas.
 Dickens, Charles. See Fielding, K. J. (art.); Simon, Irène (revd.).
 Dickins, B. See Fox, C.
 Donne, John. See Leishman, J. B.
 Dowson, Ernest. See Marshall, L. B.
Dramatic Essays of the Neo-Classical Age, ed. H. H. Adams and B. Hathaway, revd., 294.
 Draper, J. W., *The Twelfth Night of Shakespeare's Audience*, revd., 170.
 Dryden, John: *The Prologues and Epilogues of J. D.*, ed. W. B. Gardner, and *On Dryden's Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, by F. L. Huntley, revd., 397. See also Kinsley, J. (note).
 Edwards, H. L. R., *Skelton: The Life and Times of an Early Tudor Poet*, noticed, 199.
 Ehrenpreis, I., note by, The Date of Swift's 'Sentiments', 272.
Eikon Basilike. See Hughes, M. Y.
 Ennis, L., *Thackeray: The Sentimental Cynic*, revd., 295.
 Etheredge, Sir George. See Rosenfeld, Sybil.
 Evans, G. B. See Cartwright, William.
 Fairfax, Edward. See Grundy, Joan.
 Farnham, W., *Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier: The World of His Final Tragedies*, revd., 283.
 Field, Nathan: *The Plays of N. F.*, ed. W. Peery, revd., 75.
 Fielding, K. J., art. by, Charles Whitehead and Charles Dickens, 141.
 Forsberg, Rune, *A Contribution to a Dictionary of Old English Place-Names*, revd., 275.
 Fox, C., and Dickins, B., edd. *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe*, revd., 63.
 Fraunce, Abraham, *The Arcadian Rhetorike*, ed. Ethel Seaton, revd., 67.
 Furnivall's Inn. See Bland, D. S.
 Gang, T. M., art. by, Approaches to *Beowulf*, 1.
 Gardner, W. B. See Dryden, John.
 Garrick, David. See Price, C.
Gentleman's Magazine, *The*. See Greene, D. J.
Gentleness and Nobility (Malone Society Reprint), revd., 277.
 Gibson, R. W., *Francis Bacon: A Bibliography of his Works and of Baconiana to the Year 1750*, revd., 175.

Gibson, S., *A Bibliography of Francis Kirkman, with his Prefaces, Dedications, and Commendations (1652-80)*, revd., 77.
 Graham, J. See Carlyle, Thomas.
 Grant, D., *James Thomson, Poet of 'The Seasons'*, revd., 400.
 Greene, D. J., note by, Was Johnson Theatrical Critic of the *Gentleman's Magazine*?, 158.
 Greg, W. W., *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus by Christopher Marlowe: A Conjectural Reconstruction*, revd., 68; ed. *Marlowe's Doctor Faustus 1604-1616*, revd., 68; *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare*, noticed, 200.
 Grundy, Joan, note by, Tasso, Fairfax, and William Browne, 268.
 Guérard, A. J., *Thomas Hardy: The Novels and Stories*, revd., 186.
 Hall, Joseph: *The Collected Poems of J. H.*, ed. A. Davenport, revd., 177.
 Hardy, Thomas. See Guérard, A. J.
 Hathaway, B. See Adams, H. H.
 Heywood, Thomas: *T. H.'s The Rape of Lucrece*, ed. A. Holaday and T. H., by F. S. Boas, revd., 285.
 Hight, G., *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*, revd., 85.
 Hodgart, M. J. C., *The Ballads*, noticed, 199.
 Holaday, A., ed. *Thomas Heywood's The Rape of Lucrece*, revd., 285.
 Holloway, J., art. by, *The Seven Deadly Sins in The Faerie Queene*, Book II, 13.
 Hughes, M. Y., art. by, New Evidence on the Charge that Milton Forged the Pamela Prayer in the *Eikon Basilike*, 130.
 Huntley, F. L., *On Dryden's Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, revd., 397.
 Hyde, Mary C., *Playwriting for Elizabethans 1600-1605*, noticed, 89.
 Johnson, M., *The Sin of Wit: Jonathan Swift as a Poet*, noticed, 89.
 Johnson, Samuel. See Greene, D. J. (art.); Clifford, J. L. (noticed).
 Joyce, James. See Simon, Irène.
 Jump, J. D., art. by, Weekly Reviewing in the Eighteen-Sixties, 244.
 Keats, John. See Pettet, E. C., Spens, Janet.
 Ken, Thomas, bp. See Kinsley, J.
 Kinsley, J., note by, Dryden's 'Character of a Good Parson' and Bishop Ken, 155.
 Kirkman, Francis. See Gibson, S.
 Lawrence, W. W., *Chaucer and the Canterbury Tales*, revd., 377.
 Leishman, J. B., *The Monarch of Wit: An Analytical and Comparative Study of the Poetry of John Donne*, revd., 289.
 Lever, J. W., art. by, Three Notes on Shakespeare's Plays, 117.
 Levin, H., ed. *Perspectives of Criticism*, revd., 187.
 Lloyd, Evan. See Price, C.
 Lyon, J. S., *The Excursion: A Study*, revd., 81.
 Macdonald, A. See Periodical Literature.
 McIntosh, A., *Wulfstan's Prose*, revd., 166.
 Mack, M. See Pope, Alexander.
 McManaway, J. G. See Bübler, C. F.
 Marlowe, Christopher. See Greg, W. W.
 Marshall, L. B., note by, on Ernest Dowson, 162.
 Maxwell, J. C., notes by, *Dunciad IV. 121-2*, 55; *Milton's Knowledge of Aeschylus*, 366.
 Milton, John. See Hughes, M. Y. (art.); Maxwell, J. C. (note); Banks, T. H., Mohl, Ruth (revd.).
 Mohl, Ruth, *Studies in Spenser, Milton, and the Theory of Monarchy*, revd., 169.
 Moore, A. K., *The Secular Lyric in Middle English*, revd., 379.
 More, Hannah. See Bennett, C. H.
 Morgan, Margery M., art. by, *A Talking of the Love of God and the Continuity of Stylistic Tradition in English Prose Meditations*, 97.
 Morgann, Maurice. See Tave, S. M.
 Muir, K., ed. *Macbeth*, revd., 71.
 Nicoll, A., ed. *Shakespeare Survey 3*, revd., 171.
 Nicolson, Marjorie H., *The Breaking of the Circle: Studies in the Effect of the 'New Science' upon Seventeenth Century Poetry*, revd., 178.
 Owl and the Nightingale, The. See Sundby, Bertil.
 Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs, The, comp. W. G. Smith, revd., 190.
 Paston Letters. See Davis, N.
 Paul, H. N., *The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, Why, and How it was Written by Shakespeare*, revd., 386.
 Pennant, Thomas: *Tour on the Continent, 1765*, by T. P., Esqr., ed. G. R. de Beer, revd., 80.
 Pentateuch, The. See Raith, Josef.
 Peery, W. See Field, Nathan.
 Percy, Thomas: *The Percy Letters: The Correspondence of T. P. and Thomas Warton*, ed. M. G. Robinson and Cleanth Brooks, noticed, 200.
 Periodical Literature, Summary of, by A. Macdonald, 91, 201, 301, 407.
Perspectives of Criticism, ed. H. Levin, revd., 187.
 Pettet, E. C., art. by, Echoes of *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* in *The Eve of St. Agnes*, 39; *Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition*, revd., 173.
 Pinto, V. de S. See Skelton, John.

Pope, Alexander, *An Essay on Man*, ed. M. Mack, revd., 181; *Epistles to Several Persons*, ed. F. W. Bateson, revd., 292. See also Maxwell, J. C.

Price, C., art. by, David Garrick and Evan Lloyd, 28.

Publications received, list of, 207, 412.

Quarterly Review, The. See Shine, H. and Helen C.

Raith, Josef, art. by, *Ælfric's Share in the Old English Pentateuch*, 305.

Raymond, W. O., *The Infinite Moment and Other Essays in Robert Browning*, revd., 402.

Rice, C., *The London Theatre in the Eighteen-Thirties*, noticed, 300.

Richardson, Samuel. See Watt, I.

Robinson, M. G. See Percy, Thomas.

Rosenfeld, Sybil, art. by, *The Second Letterbook of Sir George Etherege*, 19.

Sackville-West, E. See De Quincey, Thomas.

Sadleir, M. See Trollope, Anthony.

Scott, Sir Walter. See Pettet, E. C.

Seaton, Ethel. See Fraunce, Abraham.

Shakespeare, William: *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. J. D. Wilson, revd., 281; *Love's Labour's Lost*, ed. R. David, revd., 380; *Macbeth*, ed. K. Muir, revd., 71. — See Lever, J. W., Tompkins, J. M. S. (arts.); Brewer, D. S., Tave, S. M. (notes); Draper, J. W., Farnham, W., Paul, H. N., Pettet, E. C., Williamson, C. C. H. (revd.); Greg, W. W. (noticed). *Shakespeare Survey* 3, ed. A. Nicoll, revd., 171.

Shine, H. and Helen C., *The Quarterly Review under Gifford: Identification of Contributors, 1809-1824*, revd., 185.

Simon, Irène, *Formes du roman anglais de Dickens à Joyce*, revd., 403.

Simpson, P., note by, Unprinted Epigrams of Sir John Davies, 49.

Skelton, John: *J. S.: A Selection from His Poems*, ed. V. de S. Pinto, and Edwards, H. L. R., *Skelton: The Life and Times of an Early Tudor Poet*, noticed, 199.

Smart, Christopher: *The Collected Poems of C. S.*, ed. N. Callan, and *Poems by C. S.*, ed. R. Brittain, revd., 78.

Smith, W. G., comp. *The Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs*, and ed., revd., 190.

Speirs, J., *Chaucer the Maker*, revd., 377.

Spence, Joseph. See Wright, A.

Spens, Janet, art. by, A Study of Keats's 'Ode to a Nightingale', 234.

Spenser, Edmund. See Holloway, J. (art.); Mohl, Ruth, Whitaker, V. K. (revd.).

Stevenson, B., *Stevenson's Book of Proverbs, Maxims, and Familiar Phrases*, revd., 190.

Sundby, Bertil, *The Dialect and Provenance of the Middle English Poem The Owl and the Nightingale*, revd., 167.

Swift, Jonathan: *The Prose Works of J. S.*, ed. H. Davis. Vol. VIII. *The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen*, with introd. by H. Williams, revd., 180. See also Ehrenpreis, I. (note); Johnson, M. (noticed).

Talkyng of þe Love of God, A, ed. Sr. Dr. M. Salvina Westra, revd., 277. See also Morgan, Margery M. (art.).

Tasso, Torquato. See Grundy, Joan.

Tave, S. M., note by, on the Influence of Morgann's Essay on Falstaff, 371.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. See Ennis, L.

Thomson, James: *J. T., Poet of 'The Seasons'*, by D. Grant, revd., 402.

Thuresson, Bertil, *Middle English Occupational Terms*, revd., 65.

Tilley, M. P., *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, revd., 190.

Tillotson, Kathleen, art. by, 'Yes: in the sea of life', 346.

Tompkins, J. M. S., art. by, *Why Pericles?*, 315.

Trollope, Anthony, *The Eustace Diamonds*, ed. M. Sadleir, noticed, 90.

Visser, Dr. F. Th., *Some Causes of Verbal Obscurencce*, revd., 188.

Wallerstein, Ruth, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetry*, revd., 290.

Walpole, Horace. See Bennett, C. H.

Warton, Thomas. See Percy, Thomas.

Watt, I., art. by, Defoe and Richardson: A Study of the Relation of Novel and Epic in the Early Eighteenth Century, 325.

Wedgwood, C. V., *Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, noticed, 299.

Westra, Sr. Dr. M. Salvina, ed. *A Talkyng of þe Love of God*, revd., 277.

Whitaker, V. K., *The Religious Basis of Spenser's Thought*, revd., 279.

Whitehead, Charles. See Fielding, K. J.

Whitelock, Dorothy, *The Audience of Beowulf*, revd., 376.

Wilkinson, A. M., art. by, The Decline of English Verse Satire in the Middle Years of the Eighteenth Century, 222.

Williams, H. See Swift, Jonathan.

Williamson, C. C. H., comp., *Readings on the Character of Hamlet 1667-1947*, revd., 388.

Wilson, J. D., ed. *Antony and Cleopatra*, revd., 281.

Wordsworth, William. See Lyon, J. S.

Wright, A., *Joseph Spence: A Critical Biography*, revd., 399.

Wroth, L. C. See Bühler, C. F.

Wulfstan. See McIntosh, A.

Yeats, William Butler. See Davenport, A.

U. S.,
ry of
with
See
, M.

Sr.
See

ce of

See

'The

upa-

verbs

ven-

the

les?,

onds,

erbal

enth-

ns.

son:

and

ury,

tury

kyng

's of

J.

of

e of

ears

s on

947,

tra,

S.

tical

, A.

CURRENT PERIODICAL SERIES

PUBLICATION NO: 1200

TITLE: REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME: 4 ISSUES: 13-16

DATE January - October 1953

Notice: This periodical may be copyrighted, in which case the contents remain the property of the copyright owner. The microfilm edition is reproduced by agreement with the publisher. Duplication or resale without permission is prohibited.

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan

MICROFILMED – 1975